ΑΙΝΟΙ, ΛΟΓΟΙ, ΜΥΘΟΙ

FABLES IN ARCHAIC, CLASSICAL, AND HELLENISTIC GREEK LITERATURE

With a Study of the Theory and Terminology of the Genre

Een wetenschappelijke proeve op het gebied van de Letteren.

Proefschrift ter verkrijging van de graad van doctor
aan de Katholieke Universiteit Nijmegen,
volgens besluit van het College van Decanen in het
openbaar te verdedigen op vrijdag 10 oktober 1997
des namiddags om 1.30 uur precies
door Johannes Gerardus Maria van Dijk
geboren op 21 mei 1963
te 's-Hertogenbosch

BRILL
LEIDEN • NEW YORK • KÖLN
1997

Promotor: Prof. dr. A.H.M. Kessels
Co-promotor: Dr. I.J.F. de Jong (UvA)

Manuscriptcommissie:
Prof. dr. J.H. Brouwers
Prof. dr. A.M. van Erp Taalman Kip (UvA)
Prof. dr. M.A. Harder (RUG)

De handelseditie van dit proefschrift verschijnt in de serie
Mnemosyne Supplements, Vol. 166
bij uitgeverij Koninklijke Brill te Leiden

© *Copyright 1997 by Koninklijke Brill, Leiden, The Netherlands*

PARENTIBVS ET VXORI

Non solum autem conducunt ad oblectandum, sed etiam vim maximam habent ad promouendum, atque persuadendum [sc. *Fabulæ*]. (Lorichius 1542, 5)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgements xi

General Introduction xiii
1. *Status quaestionis* xiii
2. The Structure of this Book xviii

Sigla xxiii
1. Ancient Authors & Works xxiii
2. Modern Authors & Works xxvi
3. General Abbreviations xxix

PART ONE
THEORETICAL BASIS

Chapter One Modern Theory 3
1. Classical Scholarship 4
Meuli 4; Perry 4; Nøjgaard 7; Koep 9; Josifović 10; García Gual 10; Adrados 11; Jedrkiewicz 13; Holzberg 15
2. Comparative Literature 15
Vandenberghe 15; Janssens 16; Doderer 17; Leibfried 18; Dithmar 20; Ewald 22; Grubmuller 22; Lindner 23; Blackham 25; Vater Solomon 26; Hassauer 27; Pawate 28; Knauth 29; Liebchen 30; Carnes 32; Carlson 32; Parussa 33; Hasubek 33
Conclusion 34

Chapter Two Ancient Theory 38
Aristophanes 38; Plato 40; Aristotle 40; Auctor ad Herennium 42; Cicero 42; Demetrius 42; Livy 43; Phaedrus 43; Seneca 44; Quintilian 45; Babrius 46; Theon 47; Luci(ll)us Tarrhaeus 51; Dio Chrysostom 51; Plutarch 52; Herennius Philo 53; Pseudo-Diogenianus 53; Suetonius 54; Gellius 54; Lucian 55; Maximus of Tyre 55; scholium on *Iliad* 55; Pseudo-Ptolemaeus 56; Tatianus 56; *Περὶ αἴνου* 56; *Life of Aesop* 56; Hermogenes 57; Philostratus 58; Alexander of Aphrodisias 59; *PMich.* 6 59; Eustathius of Antioch 60; Marius Victorinus 60; Fortunatianus 60; Iulius Victor 60; Julian 60; Ausonius 61; Aphthonius 62; Himerius 63; Themistius 63; Sopater 64; Avianus 64; Macrobius 65; Synesius 65; Martianus Capella 65; Augustine 65; Nicolaus 66; scholia on Hesiod and Aristophanes 68; Hesychius 69; Priscian 69; Agathias 69; Olympiodorus 70; *Preface to Plato* 70; Romulus 70; Isidore 71
Conclusion 71

Chapter Three Ancient Terminology 79
1. Greek Nouns 79
Αἶνος 79; Λόγος 82; Μῦθος 84; Other Nouns 88; Comparison 90
2. Latin Nouns 90
Apologus 90; *Fabula* 92; *Fabella* 94; Other Nouns 94; Comparison 95
3. *Caveat* 96
4. Fabulists 98
Aesop 98; Other Fabulists 104
5. Geographical Adjuncts 105
Carian 105; Cilician 105; Cyprian 106; Egyptian 106; Libyan 106; Lydian 106; Phrygian 107; Sybaritic 107; Comparison 108
Conclusion 110

Synthesis
1. Comparison of Modern and Ancient Theory & Terminology 112
2. Definition of the Genre 113

PART TWO
THE FUNCTION OF FABLES IN ARCHAIC, CLASSICAL, AND HELLENISTIC GREEK LITERATURE

Introduction
1. Points of Special Interest 121
2. A Note on Technical Terms 122

Chapter One Epic 124
Homer 124; Hesiod 127; Nicander 134; Conclusion 137

Chapter Two Lyric 138
Archilochus 138; Semonides 148; *Scolia* 150; Stesichorus 153; Ibycus 159; Simonides 160; Timocreon 162; Conclusion 167

Chapter Three Tragedy 169
Aristias 169; Aeschylus 169; Sophocles 176; Conclusion 181

Chapter Four Satyr Play 183
Sophocles 183; Achaeus 184; Conclusion 187

Chapter Five Comedy 188
Dinolochus 188; Aristophanes 188; Apollophanes 225; Strattis 225; Conclusion 227

Chapter Six Hellenistic Poetry 230
Callimachus 230; Theocritus 251; Cercidas 253; Conclusion 256

Chapter Seven Epigram 258
[Aeschylus] 258; Sophocles 258; Socrates 260; Leonidas 262; Antipater of Sidon 263; Carpyllides 266; Archias of Mytilene 267; Archias of Antioch 267; Conclusion 268

Chapter Eight Historiography 270
Herodotus 270; Thucydides 275; Philistus 276; Aristotle 277; Theopompus 278; Aristobulus 280; Hieronymus Cardianus 280; Diodorus Siculus 280; Conclusion 284

Chapter Nine Oratory & Rhetoric 287
Aristotle 287; Demosthenes 291; Demades 302; Philodemus 305; Demetrius 307; Conclusion 308

Chapter Ten Philosophy 311
Alcmaeon 311; Antiphon 313; Socrates 317; Democritus 319; Antisthenes 321; Plato 324; Xenophon 336; Phaedo 340; Aristotle 342; Menedemus of Eretria 344; Epicurus 345; Hieronymus Rhodius 347; Chrysippus 347; Conclusion 347

Chapter Eleven Science 351
Aristotle 351; auctor incertus 356; Conclusion 357

Chapter Twelve Grammar & Scholia 358
Aristarchus 358; Crates Pergamenus 359; Trypho 359; Conclusion 361

Final Conclusion
1. The Demarcation of Fables from their Contexts 362
2. The Interconnection of Fables and their Contexts 368
Analogy 368; Function 375; Reception 379

PART THREE
TEXTUAL SUPPLEMENT

Synopsis 385
1. Ancient Genre Theory & Terminology 386
2. Fables in Archaic, Classical, and Hellenistic Greek Literature 389

Texts 400
1. Ancient Genre Theory & Terminology 400
2. Fables in Archaic, Classical, and Hellenistic Greek Literature 442

Conspectus editionum 569

Bibliography 577
1. Fables *c.a.* 577
2. Greek Literature *c.a.* 597

Indices 611
1. *Comparatio numerorum* 611
2. *Index fabularum* 614
3. *Index locorum* 618

Appendix Non-fables & Non-allusions 631

Samenvatting in het Nederlands 685

Curriculum vitae 689

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I now come to what is certainly the most pleasant and perhaps the most difficult part of this book: duly acknowledging all my debts. Mentioning the names of some is omitting those of others.

First of all, Ton Kessels has been my supervisor from the very beginning of this fable project, when I was an undergraduate student; for all those years, he has listened patiently and encouraged me to continue along the path I chose. Irene de Jong's enthusiasm has been an energetic source of inspiration, her constructive criticism an incentive to carry on. Both more than once drew my attention to stimulating literature.

Friends and colleagues obliged me very much by kindly sending many useful books and articles from abroad: Karin Werker, Pasquale Rosafio and Elisa Mignogna from Italy; Francisco Rodríguez Adrados and Joop, Ineke and Riet van Wijnbergen from Spain; Judith Steiniger, Andreas Beschorner and Ludwich Verberne from Germany; June Clinton from Great Britain; Maarten Grond from Greece; and Rick Wright, Greg Carlson, and Laura Wilhelm from the USA. The debt Laura placed me in is extremely great, as she helpfully consented to undertake the Herculean task of correcting my English.

Participation in an interdisciplinary seminar in Leiden, in conferences of the International Reynard Society in Groningen, Orléans, and Düsseldorf, and of the Beast Fable Society in Glasgow and Santa Fe, New Mexico, has not only been invaluable but also led me to meet some of my be(a)st fable friends. Considerable progress was made during short stays at the University of Urbana-Champaign, Illinois, the Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität in München, the Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas in Madrid, and the Fondation Hardt at Vandœuvres-Genève. I am greatly indebted to the Catholic University Nijmegen and to the Netherlands Organization for Scientific Research (NWO) for financial support of all these trips abroad.

Finally, I would like to thank my parents for their unremitting interest in, and countenance of, my study in all its preliminary phases; now I can read fables to them in return. The preconditions of this book, both materially and spiritually, have been made and kept by my wife, Brigitte, whose constant support has been truly fabulous.

GENERAL INTRODUCTION

Mundus est fabula (text in book held by Descartes portraited by Weenix, 1674 (Nancy 1978))

non sunt contemnendi scriptores, qui Aesopicas fabulas ab ipso confictas prodiderunt. (Hes. 2T43 (Melanchthon))

"The context, or specific social situation, in which the fable is told and employed is ultimately the deciding factor in refining its genre." (Vater Solomon 1987, 116)

1. Status quaestionis

Fables are best known through collections. Brought together in collections, fables have conquered the world, transgressing the barriers of time and place. Aesop has reached both Aztecs and Japanese[1], and has inspired prominent modern authors like Anouilh, Vondel, Luther, Tolstoi[2], and Leonardo Da Vinci, to tread in his footsteps.

But the history of the genre is more than the history of the fable collections. Many a fable is to be found *outside* collections, in both ancient and modern literature. Fables occur not only in Aeschylus' Greek and Horace's Latin[3], but also in Shakespeare's English, Dante's Italian, Schiller's German, the Dutch of *Reinaerts Historie*[4], and the

[1] See Leicht, H., "Fábulas de Esopo en mexicano", *Investigaciones Lingüísticas* 34.4, 1935, 405-420; Brotherson, G., "How Aesop fared in Nahuatl", *Arcadia* 7, 1973, 37-43; Kutscher, G.-Brotherson, G.-Vollmer, G. (eds.), *Aesop in Mexico. Die Fabeln des Aesop in aztekischer Sprache*, Berlin: Mann 1987; Smits, I., "Aesopus in Japan. Een zeventiende-eeuwse best-seller?", *Hermeneus* 65, 1993, 168-172; Krause, W., review of Hausrath, *AAHG* 26, 1973, col. 226.

[2] See Gasparro, R., "Moralità e satira nelle 'Fables' di Anouilh", *Culture Française* 18, 1971, 207-214; Scharpé, L., "Van De Dene tot Vondel", *Leuvensche Bydragen* 4, 1900-1902, 5-63; Rehermann, E.H.-Köhler-Zulch, I., "Aspekte der Gesellschafts- und Kirchenkritik in den Fabeln von Martin Luther, Nathanael Chytraeus und Burkhard Waldis", in: Hasubek 1982, 27-42; Kratz, H., "Three High Points of the Beast Fable in Germany: Der Stricker, Luther, Lessing", *Bestia* 1, 1989, 56-57; cf. below, Chapter I.I, n. 120; Wilhelm 1994, 177-181.

[3] See below, A. 12F1-2; Quint. G18b, n. 41; Aug. G63, nn. 147-148.

[4] See Muir, K., "Menenius' Fable", *Notes and Queries* 198, 1953, 240-242; Mandruzzato, E., "L'apologo 'della rana e del topo' e Dante (*Inf.* XXIII, 4-9)", *Studi danteschi* 33, 1955, 147-165; Hinderer, W., "Die Rhetorik der Parabel. Zu ihrem ästhetischen Funktionszusammenhang und Funktionswechsel bei Friedrich Schiller", in: Elm-Hasubek 1994, 118-127; Wackers, P.W.M., "The use of fables in *Reinaerts Historie*", in: Goossens-Sodmann 1981, 461-483.

Spanish of Isabel Allende's *La casa de los espíritus*.

In Greek literature, these stray fables predate the collections. The first collection, by Demetrius of Phalerum[5], may have brought together fables occurring in the works of Archaic and Classical authors, and may have been meant as a repertory for orators looking for appropriate fables to use in their speeches—*may have*[6], as the only meagre remnant (fr. 112 Wehrli *ap.* D.L. 5.80-81) is its title: *Αἰσωπείων λόγων συναγωγαί.* The first fabulists to have a primarily literary rather than pragmatic purpose in publishing a fable collection, were Phaedrus and Babrius. Their collections, however, which are the oldest ones extant (apart from the fragmentarily preserved *PRyl.* 493)[7], date only from the beginning of the Imperial Period.

In view of the genre's tradition in antiquity[8], it is curious that the oldest extant Greek fables have never been collected since Demetrius' unascertainable *primeur*. Archaic, Classical, and Hellenistic Greek fables are to be found in the works of many different authors, in a great variety of other literary genres, both in poetry and prose, from lyric to historiography, from Hesiod to Aristotle, from *Agamemnon* to *Zopyrus*. So far, however, modern collections[9] of ancient fables included at most some[10] examples from outside the collections, and

[5] Passing over in silence alleged predecessors like Aesop (cf. e.g. Nestle 1937, 379) and Socrates (cf. Adrados 1979a, 392; below, 46. Socr.), whose activities in this field cannot be ascertained.

[6] Cf. the due caution displayed by Holzberg 1993, 24-25; see also the next note. Della Corte (1986, 87), however, reports that Demetrius' collection "conteneva un centinaio di favole in prosa", whereas Provenzo (1976, 25; likewise Jacobs 1894, p. XVI) asserts that it "probably numbered about two-hundred".

[7] Edited by Roberts, C.H., *Catalogue of the Greek and Latin Papyri in the John Rylands Library*, Manchester: UP 1938, III: *Theological and Literary Texts*, 119-128; studied by Adrados 1952. Perry (1962, 322; cf. *Aes.* T75; Della Corte 1986, 87) held it "quite possible that the text of the papyrus is that of Demetrius himself". Contra (probably rightly): Adrados 1979a, 69-73; Jedrkiewicz 1989, 26.

[8] Cf. Van Dijk 1997, 95-102.

[9] Perry (1952, 489-507), after De Furia 1810 (nos. 383-423: "ἐκ τῶν διαφόρων" = Schneider, C.E.C., *Αἰσώπου μῦθοι*, Leipzig: Weigel 1810, 157-172), Korais (A., *Μύθων Αἰσωπείων συναγωγή*, Paris 1810) and Halm (C., *ΑΙΣΩΠΕΙΩΝ ΜΥΘΩΝ ΣΥΝΑΓΩΓΗ*, Leipzig: Teubner 1854 (repr. 1911)), collects 50 "fabulae e variis scriptoribus depromptae" (*Aes.* 422-471), ten fables from the *Vita Aesopi* (*Aes.* 379-388) and occasionally inserts other specimens as variants of fables from the collections (*Aes.* 4a: Hes. 2F1, 11a: Hdt. 31F1, 269a: Arist. 39F1, 276a: A. 12F2, 356a: X. 50F1). Hausrath (1959, 152-154, 189-190) has from Them., Theophyl. Simoc., and D.Chr. two fables each.

[10] Perry (1942, 207; cf. Adrados 1978d, 226) has too much confidence in their comprehensiveness; cf. Van Dijk 1994a.

these not systematically[11]. This is the more surprising since a collection of the fables occurring in other literary genres has more than once[12] been declared a scholarly *desideratum*, in fact the one blank gap in modern *Fabelforschung*.

Such a collection may serve as a basis for comparative research by those wishing to take into account the oldest extant Greek versions of particular fables, which may differ in various degrees from[13], or even be unparalleled[14] among, the versions included in the extant fable collections. It also offers unique possibilities for the study of an important feature of the genre, viz. the use of it made in a particular (literary) context. In fable collections, contexts are not given, but are at best indicated by a promythium or epimythium, inviting or urging the reader to apply the fable to his or her own "context". Fables occurring in the works of poets and prosaists, however, have explicit literary contexts, which constitute a rich field to study the manifold intertextual and metaphorical relationships between the fable and its context, and which also, well-nigh uniquely[15], enable inquiries into the reception of popular narrative material in Greek literature.

Therefore, the neglect hitherto shown to the "extra-collectional" fables is remarkable.[16] Fable scholarship traditionally investigated the disputed historicity of its alleged founding father, Aesop[17], and the characteristics of, and intricate relationships between, the fable collections[18]. *If* attention was paid at all to the fables occurring in other

---

[11] Thus, to give only one example, *Aes.* 443 is from Semonides, 444 from Himerius, 445 from Plato.

[12] See the quotations from Adrados 1957, Jedrkiewicz 1989, and Holzberg 1993, serving as mottos to the Synopsis and the Fable Collection in Part III below.

[13] Cf., e.g., Hes. 2F1 ~ *fab. aes.* 4 Hausrath; Archil. 4F1 ~ *fab. aes.* 1; Adrados 1979a, 63; 1985, 359.

[14] See the first Index (*Comparatio numerorum*) below, fables corresponding to *Aes.* 422-470, including those unparalleled in *Aes.*.

[15] Cf. Lesky 1971, 184; Easterling 1989, 140.

[16] This applies also to modern literature. Exceptions to this rule include (in addition to the references given above, n. 4) Mombello, G., *Le raccolte francesi di favole esopiane dal 1480 alla fine del secolo XVI*, Genève/Paris: Slatkine 1981, 152-170: "Fuori dalle raccolte".

[17] Grauert 1825; Welcker 1845; Pannwitz 1966-1967; Sarkady 1968; West 1984; for the *Vita Aesopi*, see Beschorner, A.-Holzberg, N., "A Bibliography of the Aesop Romance", in: Holzberg 1992, 165-187 (some additions in Van Dijk 1994c).

[18] Notably: Bentley 1699; Tyrwhitt 1810; Dareste 1846; Hoch 1870; Zachariae 1875; Crusius 1879, 1883; Werner 1892; Hausrath 1894, 1898; Christoffersson 1901; Fusci 1901; Getzlaff 1907; Hohmann 1907; Ursing 1930; Hower 1936; Perry 1936, 1962; Hale 1941; Adrados 1948, 1952, 1979a-1985-1987a, 1984b, 1992; Marenghi

literary genres, it was the fable which was focused upon, not its function in its context.[19] It is true that particular fables (especially Hesiod's) have been the subject of more or less profound monographs[20], but a systematic, comprehensive study is still lacking.[21] Existing inventories and surveys[22] (including handbooks[23] and *apparatus critici*[24]) are far from complete on the one hand and overcomplete on the other, as may be apparent from comparing the Synopsis and the Appendix below, respectively. This applies also—to mention four recent contributions in the field—to Karadagli's dissertation, which offers little more than mere paraphrases of some of the most famous fables and contexts, to Lasserre's *exposé* on fables in Archaic Greek Poetry, which is to a large extent based upon his contestable reconstruction of Archilochus' epods, and even to Adrados' impressive *Inventario y documentación de la fábula greco-latina* and Jedrkiewicz's useful discussion of Archaic and Classical (but not Hellenistic) fables.[25]

This applies even more to fables which are not told *in extenso* but merely alluded to. These can be regarded as condensed fables, and are as suitable for studying the function of fables in contexts as longer fables. In addition, they provide promising prospects for intertextual

1954, 1955ab; Nøjgaard 1964-1967, 1979; Luzzatto 1975, 1983; Opelt 1982; Vaio 1984; Pawate 1986; García Iglesias 1986-1987; Cascajero 1991.

[19] Thiele 1908; Archibald 1912; Nøjgaard 1964, 442-444, 447-463; Adrados 1979a, 157-172, 177-181, 381-410; Cascajero 1992.

[20] See below, Hes. 2F1, n. 31. In addition: Huschke 1810, Buchholtz 1873, Archibald 1902, Luria 1930, Immisch 1930/1931, West 1982 on Archil.; Adrados 1982c on Stesich. and Semon.; Adrados 1987c, Davies 1987 on Ibyc.; Schuursma 1933, Knox 1952, Adrados 1965a, Davies 1981 on A. (cf. Van Dijk 1993c, Nappa 1994); Ewbank 1980 on Ar.; Hirsch 1985 on Hdt., Jedrkiewicz 1983 on Pl. (cf. Isebaert 1985, Pinnoy 1986-1987, Schauer-Merkle 1992, Gottfried 1993); Martínez Vázquez 1984 on Arist.; Hausrath 1949, Früchtel 1950, Corbato 1979 on Call.; Lens Tuero 1985 on D.S.; Crusius 1895a on Theopomp.; cf. Capizzi 1983 on Alcmaeon; Van Dijk 1993b, 1994b on the historiographers.

[21] Cf. Adrados 1978d, 228.

[22] Keller 1861-1867, 381-385; Dressel 1876, 19-21, 27-30; Denis 1883; Rutherford 1883, pp. XXVIsqq; Jacobs 1889, 26-29; Neubner 1889, 5-44; Hausrath 1909, col. 1706sq; Kovacs 1950, 13-28; Chambry 1960, pp. XXII-XXXI; Koep 1969, col. 140-141; Adrados 1979a, 412-417; Holzberg 1993, 14-15.

[23] Von Christ-Schmid-Stählin 1912, 189-193; Lesky 1971, 184-188; Easterling 1989.

[24] Notably the editions of Babrius by Crusius and Luzzatto-La Penna, and of the *fab. aes.* by Hausrath.

[25] Karadagli 1981 (but see Vaio 1985, Lackner's review (W., *AAHG* 39, 1986, 134), and Holzberg 1993, 40); Lasserre 1984 (but see the Appendix below, n. 5); Adrados 1987a, 1990 (some *addenda*; cf. Van Dijk 1994a); Jedrkiewicz 1987, 1989 (306-394).

explorations of the relation between "text" (the allusion) and "pre-text"—or: "intertext"[26]—(the fable alluded to), especially when the source is extant (although prudence is always called for in view of the largely unascertainable oral[27], and the substantially lacunal literary, fable tradition). Nevertheless, allusions are, in general, even more neglected than fables.[28]

This goes also for the numerous passages quoting (from), paraphrasing, or otherwise referring to, particular fables or allusions to fables. Such passages[29] are here called *testimonies*. To give an example: Hesiod's fable (2F1) is very often, and for various reasons, referred to in later Graeco-Roman literature; all these references may be considered to be *testimonies* to Hesiod's fable. In fact, such testimonies are the counterpart of later fables and allusions; testimonies might be regarded as "reciprocal" (allusions to) fables in that the latter are *by*, and the former *to*, a particular author. To give another example[30]: when Aristotle refers to a (lost) fable by Antisthenes, this reference is not only an allusion to a fable by Aristotle (52A1) but also a testimony to (an allusion to) a fable by Antisthenes (48T1). A study of these *testimonia* is not only significant for the history of the genre's reception[31], they may also report valuable information on, or interesting interpretations of, the (allusion to the) fable in question. In spite of this, a collection of, let alone an inquiry into, these testimonies does not exist.

---

[26] For these terms, see e.g. Pfister (1985, 11-20) and Riffaterre (1990, 56), respectively.

[27] See the Synthesis below.

[28] Usually, they are just mentioned in footnotes. It may be noted that the study of allusions to fables in modern literature (e.g. Sidney 1595, 130: "their mistaking of Plato (under whose lion's skin they would make an ass-like braying against Poesy)") is virtually virgin territory, too.

[29] Testimonies are understood to be only passages referring to a particular (allusion to a) *fable*, not to its context. Excluded, therefore, are, e.g., Or. *Cels.* 2.21, quoting, and D.Chr. 74.16, referring to Archil. fr. 173 West (cf. D. 19.189), as this fragment probably belongs to the context of 4F1, as well as Demetr. *Eloc.* 5, Σ *in* Pi. *O.* 6.154a and c, Plu. *Mor.* 152E, Diogenian. 3.25, and Apostol. 4.68 (Arsen. 3.68), quoting from Archil. fr. 185.2 West, as the fable proper (4F2) starts only in line 3.

[30] For some other examples, see the Synopsis below, n. 3.

[31] Therefore, they are arranged chronologically (as far as could be ascertained).

2. *The Structure of this Book*

Selecting fables which occur *outside* collections is not only interesting but also problematic, because the definition of the genre[32] is elusive. "Fable" is often conceived of as "a short moral story, esp. one with animals as characters."[33] However, that these restrictions of the genre's function and characters are not universally valid is apparent both from a quick glance at any fable collection and from a closer study of the fable tradition. When studying a fable *collection*, one might adopt a pragmatic position, considering the collection studied to define itself, however disparate its contents. When the fables *outside* the collections are the subject of research, one cannot, however, escape taking the theory of the genre into close consideration as well.

Therefore, and in view of the *status quaestionis* described above, the present dissertation consists of three parts. Its main Part (II), an analysis of the functions of the fables and allusions to fables occurring in Archaic, Classical, and Hellenistic Greek literature, is founded upon a study of the theory of the genre (Part I), and supplemented by a collection of all texts studied (Part III).

Part I, the theoretical basis, is again tripartite. Its first chapter[34] investigates modern theories by both classicists and scholars of comparative literature. The next chapter discusses the ancient passages relevant to the contemporary concept of the genre. Only part of these passages has been collected by Perry[35]; they have so far never been studied *in toto*. The third chapter examines the Graeco-Roman terminology of the genre, some aspects of which have never been involved in the discussion. A Synthesis of the first three chapters formulates a definition of the genre.

---

[32] This study considers the concept of "genre" from a nominalist rather than from a realist point of view, see Perry 1959, 17, with n. 1, and, for a discussion of some problematic implications, Jason, H., "Genre in Folk Literature: Reflections on Some Questions and Problems", *Fabula* 27, 1986, 167-194.

[33] This definition from the *Collins Dictionary of the English Language* (eds. Hanks, P.-McLeod, W. T.-Urdang, L., London/Glasgow 1986[2], 543) may serve as an example. Likewise, e.g., Dale, P. A., "George Eliot's 'Brother Jacob': Fables and the Physiology of Common Life", *Philological Quarterly* 64, 1985, 19 with 32, n. 8: "The specific association of fables with animal stories is fairly standard."

[34] Serving as an introduction into the genre's most problematic aspects, hence its 'a-chronological' order.

[35] 1952, 209-242: "Testimonia veterum de Aesopo fabulisque Aesopiis".

Part II analyses the functions of fables and allusions to fables in Archaic, Classical, and Hellenistic Greek literature, dealing with various aspects of the analogy and interrelationships between the (allusions to the) fables and their respective contexts. The chapters of Part II deal with one genre each[36], examining first poetry (epic, lyric, drama), then (historiographical, rhetorical and oratorical, philosophical, scientific, and grammatical) prose. Part II opens with an Introduction, giving a more detailed presentation of the questions asked, and is rounded off by a Final Conclusion, comparing the results.

Part III offers a collection of all Greek and Latin texts studied in Parts I and II (Fables, Allusions, Testimonies, as well as ancient passages bearing on theory and terminology of the Genre), with their relevant contexts (printed in a smaller font). The corpus collected is first presented in a Synopsis; then the texts are given. This textual supplement not only attempts to fill the lacuna indicated above (in the *Status quaestionis*) to some extent, but also, more modestly, to spare readers heuristic efforts. At the same time, and yet more prosaically, it relieves the present author of the obligation of interspersing his English with quotations from the Greek. The editions whose texts are printed are listed in the *Conspectus editionum.*

Throughout the book, cross-referencing is facilitated by means of the following system of abbreviations. All passages studied in Part II are indicated by a tripartite code, consisting of (1) a number referring to the author, (2) a letter—"F" (Fable), "A" (Allusion), or "T" (Testimony)—and (3) another number for the passage in question. The ancient passages studied in Part I are indicated by a bipartite code, consisting of (1) the letter "G" (Genre theory and terminology) plus (2) a number. One letter is added to passages subdivided for various reasons, viz. to fables which are fragmentarily preserved[37] or twice alluded to in the same context[38], and to literary works containing more than one reference to one and the same fable[39] or fables in general[40]. By means of this system of abbreviations, both the analyses and the (con)texts of all passages can be found easily in Parts I-II and

---

[36] This implies that authors (e.g. S., Arist.) whose works fall in different genres are discussed in more than one Chapter; this is not only indicated by cross references but also apparent from the Indices.

[37] E.g. Archil. 4F1a-h, 4F2a-c.

[38] E.g. Phld. 42A1ab.

[39] E.g. Archil. 4T17a-c (from Eus. *PE*).

[40] E.g. Plu. G24a-d (from the *Septem sapientum convivium*).

III, respectively, since these are in the same order. Any possible doubt as to the exact meaning of the codes may be precluded by consulting the Synopsis. For clarity's sake, the author's abbreviated name is prefixed to all codes.[41]

Three Indices (*numerorum*, *fabularum*, *locorum*) aim at making all texts and analyses easily accessible.

Bibliographical references are by the author's last name plus date of publication.[42] The Bibliography is thematic. It is hoped that the possible disadvantage of having to look twice to find full references of a particular title is compensated for by the advantage of offering a specialized (if not exhaustive)[43] fable bibliography for those wishing to study the subject.

The book is concluded by an Appendix, substantiating the exclusion from the present investigation of more or less problematic passages ("non-fables" and "non-allusions") which others would perhaps have included.

It may finally be noted, for clarity's sake, that the word "fable" is used only for the type of story (however difficult to define) included in the Aesopic collections, not in any other sense of the word ("plot", "legend"); the name "Aesop"[44] exclusively refers to the fabulist (however legendary his biography), not to any of his (pseudo-)historical namesakes[45].

Completing this preface does not bring me to the end of my argument; on the contrary, a study of the Greek fables in the Imperial Period is the sequel *in spe*—therefore, the epimythium of a fabulist

[41] Thus "Arist. G5" refers to the fifth passage studied in Part I (Chapter II), viz. Arist. *Rh.* 2.20, 1393a23-1394a18; "Ar. 17F6" refers to the sixth fable of the seventeenth author studied in Part II, viz. Ar. *Av.* 472-475.

[42] If necessary, an initial is added to the author's last name (e.g. West (M.L.) 1988 *vs.* West (S.) 1988), and a letter to the date of publication (e.g. Adrados 1978a-d).

[43] Further reading may start with Carnes 1985.

[44] As for the spelling, Greek proper names are Anglicized if established forms ("Homer", "Aesop", "Aristotle") exist, and Latinized if not, although other courses were open (cf. Leenen J., "Aesopus of Aisopos?", *Wetenschappelijke Tijdingen* 19, 1959, col. 389-394).

[45] Whether the homonymous epigrammatist (see the Appendix below), tragic actors mentioned in a scholium on Aristophanes (see below, G1a, n. 2) and by Cicero (see Münzer, "Clodius Aesopus", *RE* 4.1, Stuttgart: Metzler 1900, col. 67; cf. Achelis 1913, 436), secretary (*Suda*, αι 333 Adler), sculptor (see Robert, C., "Aisopos (2)", *RE* 1, Stuttgart: Metzler 1893, col. 1087), or alleged historiographer of Alexander (Fabricius 1718, 392, adding a *libertus*, a *dispensator*, and three more *Aesopi*).

who was a Greek but wrote in Latin may conclude the present prologue:

Supersunt mihi quae scribam, sed parco sciens:
(...)

quamvis materiae tanta abundet copia,
labori faber ut desit, non fabro labor.

(Phaedr. 3.*Epil.*1, 6-7)

Throughout this book:
F = Fable
A = Allusion
T = Testimonium
G = passage dealing with Genre theory or terminology

In the notes:
c. = context
f. = fable

1. *Ancient Authors & Works*[46]

Abst. = Abstemius (ed. Neveletus 1610)
Access. Avian. = *Accessus Aviani* (ed. Huygens, R.B.C., "Accessus ad auctores", *Latomus* 12, 1953, 306)
Ad. Cab. = Ademar Cabannensis (ed. Hervieux II)
adv. Jul. = *adversus ea quae Iuliano in Hippocratis aphorismos enuntiata sunt* (Gal.) (*CMG* 5.10.3)
Aff. Dign. = *De affectuum dignotione* (Gal.) (*CMG* 5.4.1.1)
Alcuin. = Alcuinus
Alex. Neq. *Nov. Aes./Avian.* = Alexander Nequam, *Novus Aesopus/Avianus* (ed. Garbugino, G., *Alessandro Neckam. Novus Aesopus*, Genova 1987; Hervieux III)
anon. Avian. = *anonymi Avianicae fabulae* (ed. Hervieux III)
Ant.-Avian. = Anti-Avianus (ed. Hervieux III)
Ant. *Mel.* = Antonius, *Melissa*
apol. Avian. = *apologi Aviani* (ed. Hervieux III)
Arsen. = Arsenius
Barb. = Hermolaus Barbarus
Bocc. *Geneal.* = Boccaccio, *Genealogia deorum gentilium*

[46] In addition to the abbreviations used in LSJ, *OLD*, and Lampe, G.W.H., *A Patristic Greek Lexicon*, Oxford: Clarendon P 1961 (repr. 19899). Not listed are abbreviations of MSS, *codd.*, and *recc.*, for which see the respective editions (listed in the *Conspectus editionum* below).

Branc. = (ed. Sbordone, F., "Recensioni rettoriche delle favole esopiane", *Rivista Indo-Greco-Italica* 16, 1932, 141-174)
Cassian. *Conlat.* = Iohannes Cassianus, *Conlationes*
Cedren. *Hist. Comp.* = Georgius Cedrenus, *Σύνοψις ἱστοριῶν*
Chron. = Chronicon (Eus., Hier.)
c. Jul. = *contra Julianum*
c. mend. ad Consent. = *contra mendacium ad Consentium* (Aug.)
Conf. Ling. = *De confusione linguarum* (Ph.)
Conr. Hirs. *Dial.* = Conradus Hirsaugiensis, *Dialogus super auctores*
Cons. Evang. = *De consensu Evangelistarum* (Aug.)
Const. Porph. *Them.* = Constantinus Porphyrogenitus, *De Thematibus*
Crates Perg. = Crates Pergamenus
Cyrill. *Spec. Sap.* = Cyrillus, *Speculum Sapientiae* (ed. Grässe)
Dial. = *Dialex(e)is* (Chor.), *De dialectis* (Greg. Cor.)
Dieg. = *Dieges(e)is*
Disc. cler. = Petrus Alfonsi, *Disciplina clericalis* (ed. Hilka, A.-Söderhjelm, W., Heidelberg: Winter 1911)
dist. Par. = *disticha Parisina*
Dod. = fables in dodecasyllables (ed. Chambry)
Doxap. = Iohannes Doxapatres
Epim(er). = *Epimerismi*
Erasm. *Adag.*; *Cop.*; *Mor. enc.* = Desiderius Erasmus, *Adagia*; *De copia verborum ac rerum*; *Moriae encomium*
Eth. = *Ethica* (Eust.)
Exc. de sent. = *Excerpta de sententiis* (Men. Prot.)
fab. aes. = *fabulae Aesopicae* (ed. Hausrath)
fab. dact. = *fabulae dactylicae* (ed. Crusius)
fab. extr. = *fabulae extravagantes* (ed. Hervieux II)
fab. inc. = *fabula incerta*
fab. metr., rhythm. = *fabulae metricae, rhythmicae* (Rom. Nilant.)
fab. sup. = *fabulae superstites* (Baldo) (ed. Hervieux V)
Fred. = [Fredegar]
Georg. = Georgides
Gesta Rom. = *Gesta Romanorum* (ed. Oesterley, H., *Gesta Romanorum*, Berlin 1872 (repr. Hildesheim: Olms 1963))
Gualt. Angl. = Gualterus Anglicus (ed. Hervieux II)
Herenn. Ph. = Herennius Philo
Hypoth. = *Hypothesis*
in Hipp. prorrh. = *in Hippocratis Prorrheticum* (Gal.) (*CMG* 5.9.2)

Jac. Vitr. = Jacobus de Vitriaco (ed. Greven, J., *Die Exempla aus den Sermones feriales et communes des Jakob von Vitry*, Heidelberg: Winter 1914)
Jo. Sard. = Joannes Sardianus
Jo. Sares. *Pol.* = Webb, C.C.L., Joannes Saresberiensis, *Policraticus sive De nugis curialium et vestigiis philosophorum* (ed. Webb)
Jo. Sicel. = Joannes Siceliota
J. Racend. *Syn. rhet.* = Josephus Racendyta, *Σύνοψις ῥητορικῆς*
lemm. = *lemma(ta)*
Laur. Vall. *Fac. mor.* = Laurentius Valla, *Facetiae morales* (ed. Ruelle 1986)
Lib. Did. Alex. = *Liber Didymi Alexandrini de Spiritu Sancto* (Hiër.)
Luc. Tarrh. = Luci(ll)us Tarrhaeus
Matth. Camar. *Epit.* = Matthareus Camariotes, *Epitome* (ed. Walz I)
Mazar. *Dial. fun.* = Mazaris, *Ἐπιδημία Μάζαρι ἐν Ἅιδου ἢ πεῦσις νεκύων ἐνίων περί τινων τῶν ἐς τὰ βασίλεια συναναστρεφομένων* (ed. Boissonade)
Mich. Chon. = Michael Choniates
Moschop. = Manuel Moschopulus
Nat. Com. *Myth.* = Natalis Comes, *Mythologiae*
Niceph. Basil. = Nicephorus Basilaces (ed. Pignani)
Niceph. Chrys. = Nicephorus Chrysoberges (ed. Widmann)
Niceph. Greg. *Hist. Byz.* = Nicephorus Gregoras, *Ἱστορία Ῥωμαϊκή*
Nicet. Chon. = Nicetas Choniates (ed. Van Dieten)
Nicol. Perg. *Dial. creat.* = Nicolaus Pergamenus, *Dialogus creaturarum* (ed. Grässe)
Nov. Avian. Ast., Par., Vind. = Novus Avianus Astensis, Parisiensis, Vindobonensis (ed. Hervieux III; Zurli, L.-Bisanti, A., *Astensis poetae Novus Avianus*, FLMU V, 1994)
Opusc. = *Opuscula* (Eust.) (ed. Tafel)
Pa.Bodl. = *paraphrasis Bodleiana* (ed. Chambry)
Pecc. Dign. = *De cuiusque animi peccatorum dignotione atque medela* (Gal.) (ed. Kühn)
Phil. Pract. = *Philosophia Practica universalis, methodo scientifica pertractata*, II, 1739 (Wolff)
Plac. Hipp. et Pl. = *De placitis Hippocratis et Platonis* (Gal.) (*CMG* 5.4.1.2)
Plan. = Manuel (Maximus) Planudes
Prol. Phil. Pl. = *Prolegomena Philosophiae Platonicae*
Ps.-Dos. = Pseudo-Dositheus (ed. Hausrath *ex* Goetz, G., *Corpus Glossariorum Latinorum*, III, Leipzig: Teubner 1892, 40-47, 95-102)

Psel. = Michael Psellus
rhythm. mor. = *super Aviani fabulis rhythmicae moralisationes* (ed. Hervieux III)
Raim. Bit. *Kal. Dimn.* = Raimundus de Biterris, *Kalila et Dimna* (ed. Hervieux V)
Rinuc. *Anaceph. Vit. Aesop.* = Rinucius, *Anacephalaeosis Vitae Aesopi*
Rom. = Romulus (ed. Thiele 1910)
Ruf. *Apol. c. Hier.* = Rufinus, *Apologia in Hieronymum*
Σ = *scholium, scholia*
Simp. med. temp. = *De simplicium medicamentorum temperamentis ac facultatibus* (Gal.) (ed. Kühn)
Συν. λεξ. χρησ. Λουκ. = *Συναγωγὴ λέξεων χρησίμων ἐκ τῶν τοῦ Λουκιανοῦ*
Synt. = Syntipas (ed. Hausrath)
Syr. = Syrian fables (ed. Lefèvre)
Tab. Ass. = *Tabulae Assendelftianae*
Tetr. = (Pseudo-)Ignatius, *Tetrasticha* (ed. (Crusius-)Müller))
Theod. Metoch. *Misc.* = Theodorus Metochites, *Miscellanea philosophica et historica* (ed. Müller-Kiessling)
Theod. Prodr. *Or. paup. Prov.* = Theodorus Prodromus, *Oratio in eos qui ob paupertatem Providentiae convitiantur* (ed. La Porte-Du Theil)
Tricl. = Demetrius Triclinius
Util. fab. = *De utilitate fabularum* (Melanchthon)
Vinc. Bell. = Vincentius Bellovacensis (ed. Hervieux II)
Virt. = *De virtute et vitio* (Bas.)
Zopyr. = *Zopyrus*

2. *Modern Authors & Works*[47]

AaTh = Aarne-Thompson 1964
Adrados (H.) = Adrados 1987a (Hausrath)
Aes. (S; T) = Perry 1952 (*Sententia*; *Testimonium*)
Beckby = Beckby, H., *Anthologia Graeca*, I-IV, München: Heimeran 1965-1968
A(necd.)G(r.) = *Anecdota Graeca*
An. Ox. = Cramer, J.A., *Anecdota Graeca e codd. manuscriptis bibliothecarum Oxoniensium*, Oxford 1835-1837 (repr. Amsterdam: Hakkert 1963)

[47] Reviews are abbreviated according to Marouzeau, *L'Année philologique.*

Budé = Collection Budé, Paris: Les Belles Lettres
CAG = *Commentaria in Aristotelem Graeca*, Berlin: Reimer
Chambry = Chambry, E., *Aesopi fabulae*, I-II, Budé, 1925-1926
CIL = *Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum*
CMG = *Corpus Medicorum Graecorum*
Crusius = Crusius, O., *Babrii fabulae Aesopeae... Accedunt fabularum dactylicarum et iambicarum reliquiae. Ignatii et aliorum tetrasticha iambica recensita a* Müller, C.F., Leipzig: Teubner 1897
DGE = Adrados, F.R. (ed.), *Diccionario Griego-Español*, Madrid: Instituto 'Antonio de Nebrija' 1980-
Diels-Kranz = Diels, H.-Kranz, W., *Die Fragmente der Vorsokratiker*, I-III^6, Berlin: Weidmann 1951-1952 (repr. Dublin 1966-1967)
DKP = *Der Kleine Pauly*, München: Druckenmüller 1975 (repr. 1979)
EM = *Enzyklopädie des Märchens*, Berlin/New York: De Gruyter
FFC = Folklore Fellows Communications
FGrH(ist) = Jacoby, F., *Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker*, III in 15, Leiden: Brill 1923-1958 (repr. Berlin: De Gruyter 1954-1969)
FLM (U) = Favolisti Latini Medievali (e Umanistici), Università di Genova: Istituto di Filologia Classica e Medievale (Dipartimento di Archeologia, Filologia Classica e Loro tradizioni)
Gaisford = Gaisford, T., *Poetae minores Graeci*, II: *Scholia ad Hesiodum*, Leipzig: Kühn 1823
Giannantoni = Giannantoni, G., *Socraticorum reliquiae*, I-IV, Roma: Bibliopolis 1983-1985
Grässe = Grässe, J.G.Th., *Die beiden ältesten lateinischen Fabelbücher des Mittelalters*, Tübingen 1880 (repr. Hildesheim: Olms 1965)
GCS = *Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten Jahrhunderte*, Berlin: Akademie-Verlag
G(ow)-P(age) = Gow-Page 1965, 1968
Gr.Gr. = *Grammatici Graeci*, Leipzig: Teubner (repr. Hildesheim: Olms 1965)
Halm = Halm, C., *Rhetores Latini minores*, Leipzig 1803 (repr. Frankfurt am Main 1964)
Hausrath = Hausrath, A.-Haas, H.-Hunger, H. (eds.), *Corpus Fabularum Aesopicarum*, I: *Fabulae Aesopicae soluta oratione conscriptae*, 1-2, Leipzig: Teubner 1959-1970^2
Hervieux = Hervieux, L., *Les fabulistes latins. Depuis le siècle d'Auguste jusqu'à la fin du moyen Âge*, I-V, Paris: Didot 1893-1899 (repr.: Hildesheim/New York: Olms 1970)

KAWLSK = Verhandelingen van de Koninklijke Academie voor Wetenschappen, Letteren en Schone Kunsten van België, Brussel

Lasserre-Livadaras = Lasserre, F.-Livadaras, N., *Etymologicum Magnum Genuinum, Symeonis Etymologicum una cum magna grammatica, Etymologicum Magnum Auctum synoptice ediderunt* —, I: α-ἀμωσγέπως, Roma 1976

Lefevre = Lefevre, B., *Une version Syriaque des fables d'Ésope conservée dans huit manuscrits*, Paris: Firmin-Didot 1941

Leusch-Schneidewin = Leutsch, E.L. von-Schneidewin, F.G., *Corpus paroemiographorum Graecorum*, I-II, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht 1839-1851 (repr. Hildesheim: Olms 1965)

LfgrE = Snell, B. [Hrsg.], *Lexikon des frühgriechischen Epos*, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht

Loeb = Loeb Classical Library, London(: Heinemann); Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP

LSJ (*Rev. Suppl.*) = Liddell-Scott-Jones (*Revised Supplement*; eds. Glare, P.G.W.-Thompson, A.A., Oxford: Clarendon P 1996)

(M)PG = Migne, J.-P., *Patrologiae cursus completus (series Graeca)*, 1-161, Paris: Migne 1857-1866

OLD = *Oxford Latin Dictionary*, Oxford: Clarendon P 1968

PCG = Kassel, R.-Austin, C., *Poetae comici Graeci*, Berlin/New York: De Gruyter

PMG = Page, D.L., *Poetae melici Graeci*, Oxford: Clarendon P 1962 (repr. 1967 (1st ed. corr.))

Pfeiffer = Pfeiffer, R., *Callimachus*, I-II, Oxford: Clarendon P 1949-1953 (repr. Salem, New Hampshire: Ayer 1988)

PUF = Presses Universitaires de France

RE = Pauly-Wissowa, *Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft*

Spengel = Spengel, L., *Rhetores Graeci*, II-III, Leipzig: Teubner 1854-1856 (repr. Frankfurt: Minerva 1966)

TGL = Stephanus, H.-Hase, C.B., *et al.*, *Thesaurus Graecae Linguae*, I-VIII, Paris: Didot 1831-1865

TLL = *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae*, I- , Leipzig: Teubner 1900-

TMI = Thompson 1955-1958

TragGrF = *Tragicorum Graecorum fragmenta*, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht

Ueding = Ueding, G. [Hrsg.], *Historisches Wörterbuch der Rhetorik*, 1- , Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft 1992- ;

Walz = Walz, C., *Rhetores Graeci*, I-IX, Stuttgart/Tübingen: Cotta 1832-1836 (repr. Osnabrück: Zeller 1968)
West = West, M.L., *Iambi et elegi Graeci*, I-II, Oxford: Clarendon P 1971-1972

3. *General Abbreviations*

Abh. = *Abhandlung(en)*
ad loc. = *ad locum*
ap. = *apud*
app. crit. = *apparatus/-u criticus/-o*
art. cit. = in the article cited
c.(a.) = *cum (annexis)*
cf. = *confer*
cod(d). = *codex (codices)*
col. = column
diss. = dissertation
ed(s). = edition, editor(s)
e.g. = *exempli gratia*
enl. = enlarged
et al. = *et alii*
expl. = *explicit*
fol(l). = *folium (folia)*
fr(r). = fragment(s)
Hrsg(g). = Herausgeber
ib(id). = *ibidem*
id., eund., ead. = *idem*, *eundem*, *eadem*
IL = Illinois
lc = *loco citato*
leg. = *legendum*
MA = Massachusetts
MS(S) = manuscript(s)
n(n). = note(s)
NJ = New Jersey
no(s). = number(s)
(n.)s. = (nova) series
om. = *omissum, omissa*
op. cit. = *opere citato*
phil.-hist. Kl. = *philosophisch-historische Klasse*

p(p). = page(s)
P = Press
q.v. = *quod vide*
r = *recto*
rec(c). = *recensio(nes)*
repr. = reprint(ed)
rev. = revised
s.a. = *sine anno*
sc. = *scilicet*
s.l. = *sine loco*
sq(q) = *et sequens (sequentia)*
suppl. = supplement
s(v(v)) = *sub (voce (vocibus))*
transl. = translated, translation, translator(s)
U = University
v = *verso*
viz. = *videlicet*
v.l. = *varia lectio*
vs. = *versus*
v(v). = verse(s)
vv = *vice versa*

PART ONE

THEORETICAL BASIS

MODERN THEORY

> "Uns dunkt überhaupt, man hat die Theorie von der Fabel noch nicht genug auseinander gesetzt." (Goethe, *Frankfurter Gelehrte Anzeigen* 1772)[1]

> "It is by no means the absence of previous attempts which may justify an endeavor to define the fable—for a review of even the more important definitions already current would occupy a much greater space than is here possible..." (Smith 1915, 519)

Introduction

For ages, the definition of the fable has been a vexing question. The nature of the genre's characters, its characteristics, and its relations to other (sub)genres are traditionally controversial. Since consensus has still not been reached, it seems appropriate to review the most important modern discussions of the theory of the genre. It should be kept in mind that this survey of theoretical scholarship is not an aim in itself, but only a means to elaborating a workable conception, or definition, of the genre. Therefore, the present chapter confines itself to a doxography of postwar theories[2] and focuses upon the definition and functions of the fable. Theoreticians who concentrate on the Graeco-Roman fable tradition are discussed first, followed by schol-

---

[1] Cf. Josifović 1961, 92; Noel 1975, 134-135.

[2] Older theories are discussed by: Grebel 1876; Fischer 1891; Weddigen 1893; Wienert 1925, 5-16; Staege 1929; Rammelmeyer 1939, 104-108, 125-130; Heijbroek 1941, 12-39; Espino 1942, 5-7; Markschies 1954/1955; Ott 1959; Nøjgaard 1964, 29-47; Briegel-Florig 1965; Bédier 1969, 94-106; Klemm 1969; Eichner 1974, 25-186; Leibfried 1974, 88-89; Noel 1975; García Gual 1978a, 159-160; Harth 1978; Lindner ("Bibliographie zur Gattungspoetik (5): Theorie und Geschichte der Fabel (1900-1974)", *Zeitschrift für Französische Sprache und Literatur* 85, 1975, 247-259; 1978); Hippe 1981, 10-16; Anger 1982; Mitchell 1982; Nickisch 1982; Hasubek (1983b; 1996, col. 192, 194-196); Dithmar 1984, col. 738-743; Freytag 1986; Hassauer 1986, 65-135; Pawate 1986, 13-15; Brummack 1987; Schrader 1991; Pascal (1992; 1995, 19-47); Koopman 1994; Wilhelm 1994, 206-210; Lewis 1996, 48-70. Relevant theoretical texts are collected by Leibfried-Werle 1978; Lindner 1978a, 215-235; Hippe 1981, 29-53; Dithmar 1982. Stray theoretical remarks are reported *in parenthesibus* or in the notes.

ars who analyse the genre from other points of view. The theories will be compared in a synthesizing conclusion.

1. *Classical Scholarship*

1.1 *Meuli (1954a)*

In an influential article Meuli[3] argues, extrapolating from Odysseus' αἶνος (Od. 14.457sqq), that fables originally had a sociological function: "die ursprüngliche lebendige Fabel" served as a diplomatic means for the weak, who had to conceal the naked truth (a request or a warning) in order not to offend the mighty—for instance a king (e.g. in the Sanskrit *Panchatantra*)—, although, conversely, the latter may "gelegentlich" (e.g. Hdt. 31F1) avail himself of the same means "gegenüber dem Kleinen", often with "ironisch drohenden Ton"[4].

He also points out that aetiologies are not fables, and that "Tiergeschichten" and fables are not synonymous (736). The latter distinction can be approved, but the former may not, in view of the many early Aesopic aetiologies[5].

Meuli compares the fables occurring in a specific literary context—such as those studied in the present dissertation—to "lebende Pflanze in ihrer natürlichen Umgebung", and the fable collections to a "Herbarium" (738). This metaphor drawn from nature is adopted by Karadagli[6], who considers "Meulis Darlegungen" to be "volkommen überzeugend" and therefore refrains from any theoretical discussion in her dissertation.

1.2 *Perry (1952, 1959, 1965; Ziolkowski 1990a)*

Karadagli should have referred to Perry—"uno de los mejores conocedores del género", according to Adrados[7]—, who had rightly objected to Meuli's assertion that "it is misleading to speak of 'the real fable', as opposed to other kinds, or 'the living fable', as opposed to

[3] Following Crusius 1913. For Odysseus' αἶνος, see below, 1. Homer.
[4] 744; cf. Ziolkowski 1990a, 12-13.
[5] See below, Perry (1.2); Chapter I.III, 4.1, nn. 125-126.
[6] 1981, 6; cf. Küppers 1977, 212, but compare also the criticism by Vaio 1981 and Puelma 1995, 48.
[7] 1979a, 39; cf. Ziolkowski 1990a, 7: "the patriarch of American fable scholarship".

its moribund descendants. ... all [fables] are real and living in their own time and environment, whatever their function may be".[8] Thus, the (social) function which the oldest extant Greek fables happen to have "is of no significance for the nature of fable as a whole or for the manner of its origin"[9]: the earliest Oriental fables, which predate Aesop by centuries, had a didactic function. Perry diametrically opposes Meuli also by holding that fables, like proverbs and similes, are rhetorical devices, originally meant to be used "on *any* occasion"[10] rather than in a concrete social situation.

According to Perry, the best possible definition of the genre is Theon's: μῦθός ἐστι λόγος ψευδὴς εἰκονίζων ἀλήθειαν (G20a, c). This appears to be an ideal synthesis of ancient and modern fable theory. However, Perry's translation of the definition by "a fictitious story picturing a truth" is not the best possible one; the last word is better rendered by "reality". The various elements of (Perry's interpretation of) this definition help to distinguish the fable from related (sub)genres and other forms of imagery: (1: ψευδής) "unlike the *chria* or the historical example, it must be obviously and deliberately fictitious, whether possible or not"; (2: λόγος) "unlike the Physiologus-lore and unlike the Homeric simile, both of which are framed in *general* terms, it must purport to be a particular action, series of actions, or an utterance that took place *once* in past time through the agency of particular characters"[11]; (3: εἰκονίζων) as a metaphor, the fable is indistinguishable from a particular kind of metaphorical proverb[12]; (4: ἀλήθειαν) the "truth" pictured by the fable can be general (in the collections) or specific (outside the collections), i.e. "relating to the nature of things or to types of human or animal character or behaviour" or "applying only to a particular person, thing, or situation"—the general truths are "rather matters of wordly wisdom and

[8] 1959, 18; cf. Nøjgaard 1964, 39.

[9] 1959, 24; cf. Kuppers 1977, 215; Perry's subsequent objection that fables "may serve the needs of the master...as well as those of the slave", which he—like Schmidt 1979, 80—illustrates with Hdt. 31F1, is unjust as it has already been remarked above (1.1) that Meuli makes precisely the same differentiation.

[10] 1959, 25; cf. Calvet, J.-Cruppi, M., *Le bestiaire de l'antiquité classique*, Paris: Lanore 1955, 125.

[11] 1952, p. IX. Cf. Varty 1991, 7; differently Schippers (1995, 35-38) contra Grubmuller 1977, 21. Elsewhere, however, Perry less accurately speaks about the "Tierfabeln" of the Physiologus (sv, *RE* 20.1, Stuttgart 1941, col. 1104).

[12] Cf. Quint. G18b; cf. Dornseiff, F., "Literarische Verwendungen des Beispiels", *Vortrage der Bibliothek Warburg*, 1924-1925, Leipzig/Berlin: Teubner 1927, 208.

shrewdness"[13] than "a moral or ethical principle"[14], whereas a particular truth can be a personal satire or "a clever bit of repartee".

According to Perry, a literary genre should be defined by its purpose, not by its content. "What is an Aesopic fable..., may be at the same time, when judged by its substance, a...*Märchen*, an aetiological nature-myth, a...*Streitgedicht*[15], a myth about the gods, a novella, an anecdote, or a jest"[16]. He emphasizes that a fable is not "told for its own sake" as pure entertainment.[17]

Perry admits that there are exceptions to his (and Theon's) rule. Ancient fable collections include items which are *not*: 1. obviously fictitious (ψευδής): pseudo-historical anecdotes (about Diogenes, Simonides, Socrates)[18]; 2. stories (λόγος): present tense descriptions of alleged animal (beaver, bear, ape) behaviour[19] and allegorical ἐκφράσεις[20]; 3. metaphorical (εἰκονίζων): aetiologies (e.g. Ar. 17F6) and *Streitgedichte* (e.g. Call. 20F2), which, one might object, can be taken metaphorically all right (see, e.g., Cerc. 22A1 and Call. 1c). Perry explains this problematic heterogeneity by postulating that the fabulists selected some stories not because these were 'fables' "in any strict sense of the word"[21], but primarily for their entertainment value.

---

[13] Wienert's "Lebensklugheiten" (1925, 86; cf. Schmalzriedt 1988, 184); cf. Smith's "expediency" (1915, 529) and Krappe's "common sense (1929, 66).

[14] 1959, 36; 1965, pp. XXIsq contra Lessing (1759, 96) and Thompson (1946, 10); elsewhere, however, Perry (1952, p. IX) states that a fable "must be told, at least ostensibly, ...for the sake of a point that is moral, paraenetic or personal"; cf. Adrados 1979a, 39-40.

[15] Briefly defined by Gragg (1973, 56): "a true [?] disputation gives the text of a debate", a fable "the story of a quarrel"; cf. also the literature mentioned below, Trypho 61A1, n. 20.

[16] 1959, 20; cf. Schwarzbaum 1979, p. V.

[17] 1959, 21, contra Grimm (1834), Keller (1861-1867, 313) and Hausrath (1918, 43, 47).

[18] See *fab. aes.* 65(a) Hausrath (*Aes.* 247-248); below, Simon. 9F1, n. 169; 46. Socr., n. 35.

[19] Beaver: Phaedr. *App.* 30, *fab. aes.* 120 Hausrath, *Dod.* 154 Chambry; cf. Plin. *NH* 8.109, Dsc. 2.24.2, Ael. *NA* 6.34, Σ *in* Nic. *Ther.* 565, ib. *Alex.* 307 (*Aes.* 118; Adrados 1987a, 129 (incomplete); Schumacher 1992). Bear: Phaedr. *App.* 22 (*Aes.* 550). Ape: Babr. 35, Avian. 35, *fab. aes.* 243 Hausrath, *Pa.Bodl.* 308 Chambry; cf. Plin. *NH* 8.216, Opp. *C.* 2.605-611, Physiol. *App.* 23 (pp. 320-321 Sbordone) (*Aes.* 218; Adrados 1987a, 235 (incomplete), 544 (medieval versions); Janson, H.W., *Apes and Ape Lore in the Middle Ages and the Renaissance*, London: Warburg Institute 1952, 31-33; Van Dijk 1997, 103.

[20] Phaedr. 5.8 (*Aes.* 530): *Tempus*; cf. Posidipp. 19 Gow-Page (*AP* 16.275), Callistr. *Descr.* 6, Him. *Or.* 13.1, Aus. *Epigr.* 33, Phot. *Ep.* 170, Cedren. *Hist. Comp.* 322, Tz. *H.* 8.421-427 (200), ib. 10.261-267 (322).

[21] 1965, p. XXIV.

Lenaghan[22], conversely, though deeming Perry's definition of the genre "authoritative", finds that "the collector...has to decide what a fable is before he can assemble a collection." Perry resigns himself to a theoretical aporia—"so many different kinds of story have been brought into the fable-books...that they cannot be comprehended under a single definition"—but cuts the knot by including all these anomalies in his *Aesopica.*[23] He even calls the relatively frequent aetiological variety (e.g. Call. 20F1, Pl. 49F1, Arist. 57F1) "a distinctly *early* type of 'Aesopic fable'".[24] Ziolkowski[25] endorses Perry's conception of the genre but, unlike his model, cautiously excludes these and other such anomalies[26] from the "real fables" in the ancient collections!

Perry[27] regards the epimythia, which in the collections almost invariably but often superfluously explain the preceding fable, as misinterpretations of the original function of the promythia, which served as indexes in fable repertories for orators. Ziolkowski[28] again deviates from (and misinterprets) Perry by regarding "the presence of a moral" as "the most distinctive feature of the fable form"!

1.3 *Nøjgaard (1964, 1984)*

Nøjgaard's basic principles diametrically oppose Perry's, as his "analyse structurale" of the ancient fable collections is strictly ergocentric, focusing upon the text, rather than upon the writer or the audience.[29]

[22] 1967, 11; cf. Hassauer 1986 (below, 2.11), 45.

[23] 1959, 19; *Aes.* 118, 218, 247, 439, 447, 519, 530, 550. Therefore, Adrados' criticism (1979a, 39) is not entirely just. Perry mentions yet more aetiologies (1959, 32: *Aes.* 105, 171) and *Rangstreite* (1965, p. XXVII: *Aes.* 130, 271, 294, 304, 521, 556).

[24] 1962, 301. Cf. Krappe 1929, 65-66; below, Chapter I.III, 4.1. Differently Meuli (above, 1.1).

[25] 1990a, 8-10. Like Galli 1978, 1; Schwarzbaum 1979, p. I; Beavis 1990, 476-477.

[26] In addition to some of the examples just mentioned, Ziolkowski wishes to exclude "etiological tales" like Phaedr. 4.15 and 19 (*Aes.* 515a and 517), "myths" like Babr. 12 (*Aes.* 277) and Phaedr. *App.* 7 (no *Aes.* number), and "*personification allegories*" like Babr. 70 and 126 (*Aes.* 367 and 355), and Phaedr. *App.* 5-6 (*Aes.* 535). Cf. Nisard, M.D., *Études de mœurs et de critique sur les poètes latins de la décadence*, Bruxelles: Hauman 1834, I 26: "Tout n'est pas fable dans les fables de Phèdre."

[27] 1940; cf. Wienert 1925, 23; Daly 1961a ("*Aesop without Morals*"), 12; Koep (below, 1.4).

[28] 1990a, 10; cf. 1993, 2.

[29] 1964, 14. Two decades later (1984, 229), however, he observes "la présence implicite du *personnage de l'auteur*" and: "la critique littéraire...a quelque peu méconnu l'importance du *personnage du lecteur*".

He defines fable as "un récit fictif de personnages mécaniquement allégoriques avec une action morale à évaluation".[30] By (1) "un récit fictif" he understands a description of some "real action(s)" by some individual(s); by (2) "personnages mécaniquement allégoriques" characters that *must* be interpreted allegorically, which is indicated by some deliberate impossibility in their presentation (e.g. the gift of speech granted to animals, or the visibility of gods); by (3) "action morale" the act which is to be applied to men's life, "l'action de choix", ensuing from a free choice of one of the characters; by (4) "évaluation" the equally free choice of another character, reacting to the "action morale" in words ("réplique finale") or deeds ("action finale").[31] In fables, the first choice is as a rule presented as bad, the second as good; "le plus faible" acts, "le plus fort" reacts. Characters lacking this mechanical allegory and/or freedom of choice play only supporting parts.

Armed with this hermetic definition, Nøjgaard proceeds to tackle the problematic heterogeneity of the fable collections. From these he excludes (what he considers to be) anecdotes, novellae, *fabliaux*[32], fairy tales, myths, aetiologies, and legends, mainly because these lack the indispensable "allégorie mécanique" and/or "action morale".[33] Nøjgaard's dogmatism, however, seems less appropriate than Perry's pragmatic approach, as many of his oversophisticated distinctions serve as *reductiones in absurdum*[34] of his very theory. The same goes for Nøjgaard's rigid application of his rule that indications of time and place are typically absent from fables, which makes him exclude from his corpus stories containing even unspecified temporal adjuncts like ποτε and εἶτα, and/or local adjuncts, unless these are "absolument indispensables".[35] All the same, certain technical terms introduced by

[30] 1964, 82.

[31] Cf. Zinato 1989, 246.

[32] For the relation between fable and *fabliau*, see, e.g., Bergerfurth 1979, with further literature.

[33] Some examples: *fab. aes.* 138 Chambry (117 Hausrath; *Aes.* 115) is a novella, *fab. aes.* 150 Chambry (86 Hausrath; *Aes.* 84) a *fabliau*, *Pa.Bodl.* 79 Chambry (*Aes.* 296) a fairy tale (according to Nøjgaard).

[34] To give only one example: Phaedr. *App.* 9 (*Aes.* 539) is not a fable, for "l'action n'est pas morale. En effet la poule n'agit pas comme un être libre ayant la possibilité de choix, mais comme une poule ordinaire dirigée par les mêmes lois naturelles que les poules du lecteur" (83). Other examples are given by Adrados 1979a, 40-42; cf. below, Hdt. 31F1, n. 18; Jedrkiewicz's criticism (1989, 280, n. 64).

[35] Thus, according to Nøjgaard, *fab. aes.* 328 Chambry (238 Hausrath; *Aes.* 269) is a fable *in spite of* the local adjunct παρά τι δένδρον, as "l'arbre [où le sanglier aiguise ses dents] est un instrument, non un endroit!" (1964, 239)

Nøjgaard—especially *action et réplique finales*, and *survenant*[36]—are very convenient and will accordingly be used in the pages to follow.

As "faux critériums" for a fable definition Nøjgaard lists the genre's alleged comic, didactic, entertaining, satirical, parodic nature, its length[37] and style, the presence of a "moralité", and the nature of its characters.[38] He rightly observes that "rien n'empêche les dieux d'avoir la fonction de personnages", but is less liberal than he might seem, since he (somewhat abstrusely) stipulates that "les dieux ne sont plus regardés en tant que dieux"; the same goes, *mutatis mutandis*, for human characters. Moreover, he calls stories with humans only anecdotes, not fables[39], and considers personification to be a "récit indépendant".

1.4 *Koep (1969)*

Like Perry (above, 1.2), Koep thinks a universal definition of the genre to be illusory. Among its "typische[n] Merkmale" he includes[40] its brevity and fictitiousness, which distinguishes fable from myth. These two genres differ also in that the former is "unheroisch, anti-idealistisch,...areligiös[41]". Koep[42] firmly opposes any restriction of fable characters. He emphasizes[43] also that the genre "will...ebenso unterhalten wie...belehren", without, however, needing an epi-

[36] "*Personnage introduit après l'action de choix et l'action finale* (s'il y en a), *non engagé activement dans l'action, mais qui la commente dans sa réplique terminant la fable*" (1964, 159-160).

[37] With Grimm (1834, p. XVIII; cf. Richer in Noel 1975, 44; Perry 1959, 21): "die Kürze [ist] der Tod der Fabel" (cf. Zymner 1991, 151); contra Lessing (1759, 134, discussing La Fontaine 1668, 33: "la brèveté, qu'on peut fort bien appeler l'âme du conte"; cf. Izmajlov in Rammelmeyer 1939, 126).

[38] 1964, 106-121. Unlike Küppers' (1977, 211, n. 2) and Adrados' (1979a, 40; cf. La Penna's (A., review of Nøjgaard 1964, *Athenaeum* 44, 1966, 355-356) and Zinato's (1989, 247)), Josifović's criticism (1974, 24) of Nøjgaard's definition is unjust, inasmuch the former apparently assumes that the latter uses "action morale" and "moralité" as synonyms, which is definitely not the case.

[39] 1964, 82-89. According to Nøjgaard, Arist. 39F2 is a fable but J. *AJ* 18.174-175 (6.5) (see Van Dijk 1993b, 32-33; 1994a, 105; 1994b, 129-130, nn. 113-123; cf. Abst. *Praef.*, p. 533 Neveletus) is not, although "ils se distinguent précisément que par les personnages; sous tous les autres points de vue ils sont à peu près identiques."

[40] Referring to Bieber 1906, 2; cf. McMahon 1927, 1.3.

[41] Cf. Pugliarello 1973, 20-22.

[42] Like, e.g., Houdar de La Motte 1719, 81 (cf. Pascal 1992, 180-181).

[43] Again joining Bieber (1906, 6); cf. Wienert 1925, 11, 22.

mythium, because its 'moral' is evident: a fable "erzählt einen konkreten Einzelfall" but "zielt...auf eine allgemeine Wahrheit ab", which is "rein innerweltlich[e], nicht zuletzt...politisch[e]".[44]

1.5 *Josifović (1961, 1974)*

Josifović defines the fable as "die Erzählung einer erfundenen Geschichte aus dem Leben der verschiedensten Naturwesen..., die hier als Menschen redend und handelnd vorgeführt werden, und zwar zu einem mehrdeutigen Zweck, der von Fall zu Fall wechselt".[45] He emphasizes[46] the occurrence of animals, plants and inanimate objects as fable characters, and deems the presence of gods in fables "bedenklich", which might be disputed by referring to Nøjgaard (above, 1.3).

According to Josifović, fables may have "einen lehrhaften, pädagogischen, philosophischen, gnomischen, rhetorischen, politischen oder komisch-märchenhaften Charakter".[47] This list is both disparate and inaccurate: philosophy is a genre (see below, Chapter II.X), not a function; by "gnomisch" Josifović appears to mean that a fable may become a proverb and *vice versa* (which, in itself, is right); his discussion of "die märchenartige Fabel" (ib. 39) means digging up again the theories of Grimm *cum suis*, for which one might refer to Perry (above, 1.2).

Unlike Perry and Nøjgaard, Josifović considers a fable without an epimythium to be "oft fast undenkbar, ja manchmal sogar unverständlich".[48]

1.6 *García Gual (1977, 1978ab, 1995)*

García Gual considers the fable to be a mechanically allegorical story with an explicit or implicit, logically inescapable, moral intention.[49] The allegorical character and moral intention distinguish fables from fairy tales, the dramatic character from items in the collections which

[44] Col. 131-133. Cf. Meuli (above, 1.1); Küppers 1977, 210-213.
[45] 1974, 24.
[46] 1974, 29.
[47] 1974, 32. Compare, however, the criticism of Küppers (1977, 215, n. 2) and Holzberg (1993, 8-9).
[48] 1974, 33.
[49] 1995, 15.

do not involve action (e.g. the Fox and the Mask).[50] García Gual is obviously influenced by Nøjgaard (above, 1.3)—he even Hispanicizes the latter's central notions "possibilité de choix" and "évaluation"—but deviates from his model by underlining that fables are typically short.

Like Meuli (above, 1.1), García Gual contends that fables were applied first concretely (either personally or politically), then generally. Conversely, he disposes[51] of the sociological theory adhered to by Meuli by backing up Gasparov (1968), whose analyses of the genre's fundamental conservatism show that fables typically describe a class society rather than prescribe class struggle.

1.7 *Adrados (1979a, 1982b, 1989, 1996)*

Adrados, whose publications on the genre span half a century, takes the ancient fable collections as point of departure.[52] The contents of these collections may seem heterogeneous to modern readers, who tend to think of fable as beast fable, but this misconception is (according to Adrados) due to modern fabulists like La Fontaine, Iriarte and Samaniego (although none of these would agree).[53] Adrados objects that in antiquity these disparate materials were apparently felt to be, in some way, homogeneous, witness their very inclusion in one collection of "Aesopic fables"[54].

A fable is basically a "segundo término, un ejemplo al servicio de

[50] 1977, 125. Phaedr. 1.7, *fab. aes.* 27 Hausrath, Rom. 44 Thiele (*lupus*), Apostol. 18.60 (Arsen. 55.70); *Aes.* 27; Adrados 1987a, 53-54, 496 (medieval versions (to which Dati 7 may be added)).

[51] 1977, 129-131; 1978b, 196-199.

[52] Cf. the basic assumptions of Schippers' study of Middle Dutch fables (1995, 54, 65).

[53] 1979a, 32; but cf., e.g., La Fontaine, *Fables* 1.16 "La mort et le bûcheron" (id. 1668, 37: "Aristote [G5] n'admet dans la fable que les animaux; il en exclut les hommes et les plantes [*quod non*]. Cette règle est moins de nécessité que de bienséance, puisque ni Ésope, ni Phèdre, ni aucun des fabulistes, ne l'a gardée"); Samaniego, *Fábulas* 5.11 "El carretero y Hércules" (ed. Jareño, E., Madrid 1991^3, 144); Iriarte, *Fábulas literarias* 55: "El juez y el bandolero" (ed. Prieto de Paula, Á.L., Madrid 1992, 219).

[54] Demetrius' collection is entitled Λόγων Αἰσωπείων συναγωγαί (*ap.* D.L. 5.80), Phaedrus' *Fabulae Aesopiae*, Babrius' Μυθίαμβοι Αἰσώπειοι, which may have misled Schippers (1995, 129-130) into thinking that Aesop's fables were translated by Phaedrus and adapted by Babrius; on Phaedrus' and Babrius' originality, see e.g. Holzberg 1993, 50 and 65.

un primer término".[55] As such, Adrados[56] holds, the genre is comparable, if not identical, with myth, anecdote, and simile. Any story placed within a frame with an illustrative, explanatory, or persuasive function, becomes a fable, although absurd or contrived epimythia may indicate the origin of unsuccessfully assimilated ("fabulized") jests, anecdotes, enigmas, themes from Natural History, or myths.[57] The frame may be either (primarily) the context of a fable occurring in another literary genre, or (secondarily) the promythium or epimythium of a fable included in a collection. Adrados regards the promythium and epimythium as an essential element of the genre, "única huella del primer término"; fables lacking this element (e.g. *fab. aes.* 293 Hausrath) he would call "no-fábulas".[58]

Adrados conceives of fable as "un género ... 'abierto'"[59] ("an 'open' genre"), displaying manifold variations, modifications and transitions to and from other genres ("fabulizaciones") (especially proverb—another Aesopic genre[60]—and simile). Accordingly, he refrains from a strict definition, but distinguishes a nucleus, in which the most frequent characteristics (regarding form and content) are all present, and a margin, in which some are absent. According to Adrados, a fable, unlike a simile and a proverb, "narra un sucedido único y concreto que ha tenido lugar en otro tiempo, y que...es simbólico".[61] "Los rasgos de lo fictivo[62] y lo animalístico" are frequent but not indispensable. He adds that the fable has always been critical (satirical, comical, "iambic") and popular.[63]

As to its structure, the main type is tripartite[64] and "agonal": fables typically relate some conflict (in action and/or words) between two

---

[55] 1979a, 43.

[56] Examples given: Hes. *Op.* (myths); Archil. fr. 182-184 West, Hdt. 6.86 (anecdotes); Thgn. 667-682 (simile). Cf. "La poesía de Arquíloco e Hiponacte a la luz de los últimos descubrimientos papirológicos y epigráficos", in: *Actas del primer Congreso Español de Estudios Clásicos (Madrid, 15-19 de abril de 1956)*, Madrid: Sociedad Española de Estudios Clásicos 1958, 186; 1989, 63; 1993; 1995, 112.

[57] 1979a, 52-57. Cf. Perry (above, 1.2).

[58] 1979a, 53. Cf. Josifović; (above, 1.5); differently Perry and Nøjgaard (1.2-3).

[59] 1979a, 11.

[60] See below, Chapter I.III, 4.1, n. 134.

[61] 1979a, 46-47; cf. Perry's "metaphorical" and Nøjgaard's "allégorique" (above, 1.2-3).

[62] 1979a, 59; cf. 47: "el que el sucedido sea fictivo o no, es menos importante"; 1982b, 35: "es, con pequeñas excepciones, un drama ficticio o considerado como tal, no un sucedido histórico"; 1996, 584.

[63] 1979a, 11; 1982b, 35, 46; cf. 1989; 1996, 584.

[64] Cf. Nøjgaard 1964, 141; García Gual 1978a, 162.

antagonists, which is preceded by an introductory sketch of the situation and followed by a concluding action or statement ("cierre"). This scheme may be elaborated in various ways, for instance by the addition of a tritagonist or a *survenant*. An important subspecies is the "fábula de situación", in which the first stage (situation) dominates the second (*agon*) (e.g. A. 12F1). Another type is the aetiological fable (e.g. Ar. 17F6), which is connected with the myth and the riddle (yet another Aesopic genre[65]). Adrados points out that the different types are unified by the genre's central theme: nature, more particularly, its unchangeability—hence the predominance of animal characters[66]; "el hombre y el dios solo entran en forma ocasional y periférica" (which is an understatement[67]).

Adrados[68] also draws attention to formulaic introductions of fables (ποτε (e.g. Ar. 17F1)) and epimythia (ἀτάρ, οὕτως (e.g. Arist. 39F1-2)), and other typical formal elements, notably unspecified time adjuncts (κἄπειτα, εἶτα (e.g. Ar. 17F2-4)) and characters (τις, ἀνήρ (e.g. A. 12F2)).

1.8 *Jedrkiewicz (1989)*

Jedrkiewicz's position is yet more pragmatic than Adrados', in that the former regards as "Aesopic fable" all stories thus labelled in the ancient tradition, whether included in the collections or not (292). However, Jedrkiewicz does not explicitly discuss the problem of "non-Aesopic" fables. He emphasizes that the genre's typical structure is that of "rovesciamento della situazione [inversion of an actor's role or position]—bivalenza dell'azione [an action has a negative result]—ambiguità del valore" [the pursued goal proves to be unattainable, non-existent, or undesirable].[69] He regards this "struttura esopica" as the unifying element of the heterogeneous collections: both the standard "racconti d'azione" and the secondary aetiologies, proverbs (?), animal stories, and debates involve a *peripeteia*, explaining or drawing attention to "gli aspetti problematici dell'esistenza".[70] In each fable he distinguishes three semantic levels of increasing

[65] See again below, Chapter I.III, n. 134.
[66] 1979a, 48-51; cf. 1988a; 1989, 62.
[67] See the enumerations in Van Dijk 1995a, 236, n. 5.
[68] 1948, 235-237; 1979a, 383sqq, 397sqq, following Fraenkel 1920.
[69] 245-253; cf. Vindt 1927, 99-100.
[70] 261-263; cf. Adrados' thematical approach (above, 1.7).

abstraction, each with its own *significans* and *significatum*: narrative—symbolic—allegorical. On the first level, the narrative relates some action; on the second, (a) the "morale" or the "battuta finale" (Nøjgaard's *réplique finale*) refers to some "regolarità esistenziale" in the collections, or (b), in fables inserted in a context, "traslazione analogica" applies the fable to its specific context[71]; on the third level, the characteristic polar structure clarifies a corresponding "complesso concettuale".

Jedrkiewicz distinguishes two types of fables, all of which are basically anecdotes ("racconto esopico"), according to the characters involved: "fables" *stricto sensu*, with non-human characters (animals, plants, and objects), and "anecdotes" *stricto sensu*, with human characters. The action of both types is fictitious, but that of the first is improbable, that of the second probable.[72] This bipartition is somewhat confusing—more so, at any rate, than Aphthonius' tripartition (G54), which includes a mixed category—, as Jedrkiewicz uses both "fable" and "anecdote" both in a broader and in a stricter sense of the word. He yet adds to the confusion by reporting that "figure mitiche [gods] rientrano a piacere nell'una o nell'altra delle due categorie". Unlike myths, however, fables lack "importanza collettiva" and "carattere formalizzato".[73]

Stylistically, a fable has to be comprehensible (but not necessarily simple)[74] and concise (but not necessarily brief). There is no universal "lingua favolistica", each fabulist using individual stylistic and linguistic means (267). Jedrkiewicz[75] discusses some formulas occurring in the introduction, end, or *fabula docet*, and speculates that this formularity may have facilitated the oral tradition of fables. He dwells upon the genre's logically irrefutable persuasive function, which is based upon internally consistent fiction. Epimythia he considers to be indispensable for fables included in a collection.[76] He observes that these

---

[71] 280-283; elsewhere, however, Jedrkiewicz (1989, 261) adds that fables can be told "per il 'piacere di narrare' in sè", which might be contradicted by referring to Perry (above, 1.2).

[72] Cf. the distinction between *fabula* and *argumentum* in, e.g., Auct. ad Her. 1.8.13 and Cic. *Inv.* 1.19.27, for which see the Appendix below.

[73] 220, 260, referring to Burkert, W., *Structure and History in Greek Mythology and Ritual*, London 1979.

[74] 263; cf. e.g. Pomey 1665, 15-23, teaching to tell fables in different styles ("*stylo simplici, oratorio, rudi, comptiore, floridiore*"). Differently McMahon 1927, 1.3; Vindt 1927, 104.

[75] 269-271, following Karadagli 1981, 97sqq.

[76] Cf. Josifović and Adrados (above, 1.5, 1.7).

"morals" are really amoral[77], but continues to use this traditional but infelicitous term.

1.9 *Holzberg (1993)*

Holzberg (21-24) points out that the conception of the genre in antiquity should not be measured by modern standards. Those who simply equate fable and animal fable fail to recognize that fable literature traditionally comprised other types of stories, too, notably aetiologies and *Rangstreite*, and all other possible kinds of characters in different combinations. In addition, Holzberg (18-19) declares the popular[78] sociological theory to be an erroneous extrapolation of Phaedrus' explanation for the genre's origin (G14). Fables are, rather, told from other perspectives. For all these reasons, Holzberg joins Perry (above, 1.2) in both his recommendation and interpretation of Theon's fable definition (G20a, c).

Although the contents and functions of ancient fables may vary greatly, their form and structure are remarkably similar. Holzberg points to the gradual development of typical formulas, especially in the introduction of the epimythium (οὕτω δὲ καὶ ὑμεῖς/σύ)[79], and a standard tripartite structure: "Exposition"—"Aktion"—"Schlußwort" (Nøjgaard's *réplique finale*; above, 1.3).

2. *Comparative Literature*[80]

2.1 *Vandenberghe (1950)*

Vandenberghe defines fable as a fictitious, allegorical story with a

---

[77] Cf. Sternberger 1943, 72; Perry (above, 1.2). Pérez de Ayala (R., "Dos morales. El fracaso vital", in: id. 1985, 15-16 (originally appeared in *ABC* 23-12-1948), 16) specifies: "Las fábulas, como la naturaleza misma, no son morales ni inmorales, ni siquiera amorales. Son inframorales o premorales."; cf. eund., "Menéndez Pelayo y la moralidad de las fábulas", ibid. 21-24 (*ABC* 14-10-1956), and "Moral de las fábulas", ibid. 25-28 (*ABC* 18-10-1956).

[78] See above, Meuli (1.1); below, n. 145.

[79] His mentioning (p. 23) A. 12F2 (besides S. 13F1-2, Ar. 17F3, Arist. 39F1-2, X. 50F1) in this connection seems to presuppose a debatable interpretation of 737 πάραυτα (see below, A. 12F2, n. 36).

[80] Doderer, Leibfried, Dithmar, Liebchen and Hasubek are Germanists; Grubmüller medievalist; Lindner and Blackham comparatists; Pawate Sanskritist; Vater Solomon Hebraist; Janssens, Ewald, Hassauer, Knauth and Parussa Romanists;

moral application[81], usually an "ervaringsmoraal"[82]. Typical of the genre is neither the kind of its characters—the collections including anecdotes and aetiologies (50)—nor its (im)probability, but, rather, its didactic character[83], which distinguishes fables from fairy tales[84] and animal stories[85]. Fables differ from parables in that the latter represent a *religious* truth[86], while allegories correspond *completely* to something else[87]. These definitions are less clear than they seem to be, as he adds that parable includes fable, and that allegory and parable are essentially identical (16).

2.2 *Janssens (1955)*

Much like Vandenberghe, Janssens defines fable as a fictitious, allegorical story, but adds that fables are always short and should have a "moralité". He states that fables feature both rational and non-rational characters, but (over)emphasizes the occurrence of animals. He regards the genre as exclusively didactic, and deems other functions, notably "intentions...satiriques ou politiques" "bien étrangères à son principe". This restriction diametrically (if implicitly) opposes the sociological fable theory, but is an untenable generalization all the same (cf. Perry's criticism of Meuli, above, 1.1-2).[88]

Vandenberghe, Carnes and Carlson classicists focusing upon modern literature. Most include classical scholarship in their theorizing. The theories of Grubmuller, Leibfried, Dithmar, and Blackham are discussed also by Schippers 1995, 32-49.

[81] 17; cf. Houdar de La Motte 1719, 61 (cf. Pascal 1992, 176).

[82] 72. Cf. Perry's "matters of wordly wisdom and shrewdness" (above, 1.2); Winkler 1922, 61.

[83] Cf. Vindt 1927, 109.

[84] Cf. Bolte-Polívka 1912-1932, IV 120; Wienert 1925, 17; Aly 1928, col. 256; Luthi 1962, 12; Voretzsch, C., introduction to Baesecke, G.-Schrobler, I. [Hrsgg.], *Das mittelhochdeutsche Gedicht vom Fuchs Reinhart*, Halle 1952², p. VI, quoted by Jauss, H.R., *Untersuchungen zur mittelalterlichen Tierdichtung*, Tubingen: Niemeyer 1959 (Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie 100), 16.

[85] Cf. Smith 1915, 523-524; Thompson 1946, 10; Schwarzbaum 1979, p. V.

[86] Cf. Smith 1915, 526; Wicher 1923; Thite 1984, 39.

[87] Cf. Wienert 1925, 16.

[88] Cf. e.g. Wilhelm (1994, 198-206, 229-230) and Pascal (1995, 215-228: "Les fabulistes polémistes et caricaturistes") on political-satirical Russian and French fables, respectively; furthermore: Lall, R.R., *Satiric Fable in English...*, New Delhi: New Statesman Publishing Company 1979; Grimm, J., "'J'oppose quelquefois, par une double image...' Le style satirique des *Fables*", in: id., *Le pouvoir des fables. Etudes Lafontainiennes* I, Paris/Seattle/Tubingen: Biblio 1994, 245-259.

2.3 *Doderer (1970; Knapp 1979, 1984)*

Doderer conceives of fable as a play performed by actors on a stage[89] which is empty but for some indispensable requisites, specific indications of place and time lacking as a rule[90] (unlike in the "Schwank"). The characters are types, not individuals.[91] All kinds of characters may occur, although men only "vereinzelt"; Knapp[92], though quoting Doderer with approval, even proposes to *exclude* human characters and "mythische Gestalten" from fables. According to Doderer, the (anthropomorphized) characters are "un/anti-realistisch"[93] (unlike in animal stories and anecdotes), one-dimensional (like in fairy tales)[94], and belong to a "Fabelreich" with "ihre eigene[n] Gesetze".[95] His assertion that "schon in der griechischen Antike...die Figuren der Fabel...ohne Rucksicht auf Realbezuge zusammengestellt sind" (64) is contradictory to Theon's definition (G20a, c; if not in Perry's translation).

Doderer emphasizes the genre's "Doppelfunktion—als asthetisches Gebilde und als didaktisches Instrument", and states that one should not isolate the first[96] or second[97] function. A fable does not need an "Anamythion [?], Epimythion oder...reflektierende[n] Einschiebseln", as its "Lehrcharakter" is graphically evident[98]. He remarks that fables do not teach a "Morallehre" but "Anweisungen zum Überleben in einer amoralischen Welt".[99] The typical point of a fable is the

---

[89] A traditional metaphor, see e g Wilhelm 1994, 6

[90] Cf Grimm 1834, p XV, Nøjgaard (above, 1 3), García Iglesias 1986-1987, 251 "son atemporales y carecen de geografía" Exceptions to this rule are listed in the Final Conclusion below (1 , with n 3)

[91] Cf Sternberger 1943, 79.

[92] Doderer 1970, 63, Knapp 1979, 105, but cf n 67 above

[93] Cf Lessing 1759 "denaturiert"

[94] 80, following Luthi, M , *Das europaische Volksmarchen*, Bern 1960[2]

[95] 41, 90 This seems to be the kind of genre conception opposed by Perry (above, 1 2), but see 177 "Wir gehen davon aus, daß Gattungen als zeitlose Urtypen nicht bestehen "

[96] Contra Grimm 1834 and Staege 1929, 61

[97] Cf Koep, Baldwin, S W , Jr , "The Role of the Moral in 'La Vida del Ysopet con sus fabulas historiadas'", *Hispania* 47, 1964, 762 Contra Lessing 1759

[98] 59, 99-100 Cf Lessing's definition (1759, 104) "Wenn wir einen allgemeinen moralischen Satz auf einen besonderen Fall zuruckführen, diesem besonderen Falle die Wirklichkeit erteilen und eine Geschichte daraus dichten, in welcher man den allgemeinen Satz anschauend erkennt so heißt diese Erdichtung eine Fabel", Winkler 1922, 61, Sternberger 1941, 15-17, above, Perry (1 2), Vandenberghe (2 1)

[99] 113, referring to Ott 1959 and Sternberger 1941, Knapp (1979, 106, 1984, 293), cf Perry, Jedrkiewicz (above, 1 2, 1 8)

inversion[100] of the expected "Überlegenheitsverhältnis" between two "Kontrastfiguren". Fables characteristically depict a "Zwangslage" (109-111) as just, escapable or, conversely, inescapable. The genre's "didaktischer Horizont" varies "von Autor zu Autor..., von Epoche zu Epoche"; fables can teach both "Anpassung und Widerstand"[101]. Doderer is again followed (and modified) by Knapp[102], who considers "ein unterschiedliches Mischverhältnis von lehrhaftem Ernst und unterhaltsamem Scherz als Gattungskriterium". To Doderer, any strict definition would be a "Quadratur des Zirkels", in view of the heterogeneity of the ancient fable collections.[103]

He declares the problem of distinguishing fable from "Beispiel", "Gleichnis", parable and allegory to be non-existent: fable is a genre but the latter are not; fables can have "Gleichnis-, Beispiel- und Parabel [- and allegory-] intention" (179). This cuts the Gordian knot only to create[104] a Babel-like confusion. He compares the use of "Abbreviaturen" of fables to proverbs (174-175). However, some of his examples ("Schaf", "Esel") are metaphors rather than allusions to particular fables. According to Doderer, fables are most closely related to "Märchen", both historically and structurally, but in the latter dreams come true whereas the former typically settle with illusions.[105] Fairy tales, as well as jokes, "Volkslieder" and sagas, also lack the didacticism of fables.[106]

2.4 *Leibfried (1982a [1967], 1984; Hippe 1981)*

Leibfried, rejecting earlier theorizing on the fable as too "statisch", asserts that the genre cannot be defined. However, his critique is not entirely just. First, he criticizes[107] Meuli's (and others') sociological

---

[100] Cf. Jedrkiewicz's "rovesciamento della situazione" (above, 1.8).

[101] 129-130. Cf. Kreis (1974, 63), Ziolkowski (1990a, 11), as well as Perry (above, 1.2).

[102] 1979, 111; 1984, 296, referring to Suchomski, J., *'Delectatio' und 'utilitas'*, Bern 1975.

[103] 176; cf. again Perry (above, 1.2).

[104] Like Vandenberghe (above, 2.1); cf. Knapp's unilluminating terminological subdivisions (1979, 104-105; 1984, 289, n. 84).

[105] 179-184. Differently Lüthi 1962, 12: "die *'Fabel'* gehört zum Kreis der Erzählgattungen, die wie das Märchen inhaltlich über den Rahmen des irdisch Möglichen hinausgehen."

[106] 95; cf. again Vandenberghe (above, 2.1).

[107] 1982a, 12-16; 1984, 25-37, referring to Schmidt 1979, 74-80; cf. Perry (above, 1.2).

theory by remarking that fables can be applied "zur affirmativen Sozialisation" just as well (e.g. Liv. 2.32.9-11; G11)[108], but this modification does no justice to the fact that Meuli made a similar differentiation (see above, 1.1).

Secondly, and more importantly, Leibfried's own theory is static itself[109], in one respect even more so than those criticized by him. For unlike all theoreticians discussed above, he restricts the fable characters to animals, plants, and inanimate objects.[110] However, one glance in any fable collection shows that this statement is too categorical.[111] The same goes for his additional restrictions that fables have at most two "Vertreter einer Handlung"[112], and that the characters' typification is constant.[113] His subsequent subdivision into "Charakterfabeln", featuring "Tiertypen", and "Schicksalsfabeln", "in denen untypische Tiere auftreten", is both irrelevant and questionable.[114] He also points[115] to the genre's "Wirklichkeitsillusion".

Leibfried considers fables to be tripartite in that (1) a story is applied by means of (2) a "Lehre" to (3) a "Fall, der im Leben des Lesers vorliegt oder vorliegen kann". However, this tripartition[116] is confusing, as only the first part belongs to the fable proper, while the second is optional and the third belongs to the context. Moreover, his position towards the second part is not quite clear: he deems fables

---

108 The Belly and the Members; references given below, 44. Alcmaeon, n. 8.

109 Cf. Schippers' criticism (1995, 39-40).

110 1982a, 22 = Hippe 1981, 17.

111 See Van Dijk 1995a; cf. the criticism by Ewald (1977, 29, n. 1; but see below, 2.6).

112 See e.g. fables in which a third party offers to arbitrate in a dispute (Call. 20F2; Babr. 39 (*Aes.* 62)) and Nøjgaard's discussion of the typical *survenant* (above, 1.3).

113 1982a, 23 (Hippe 1981, 18), following Grimm (1834); but see Nøjgaard 1964, 309: "*nos collections ne connaissent pas une notion comme 'les caractères animaux constants'.*" Cf. also Daly 1961a, 19; Schwarzbaum 1969 (1979, 42-47): "The Fox Outfoxed".

114 1982a, 24 (= Hippe 1981, 19): "die Maus, der Frosch...haben keinen festen Charakter in der Fabel... Sie sind farblos, blaß." Differently, e.g., Marchesi (quoted (to be refuted) by Nøjgaard 1964, 315): "le rane hanno una significazione costante nella favola esopica: rappresentano la collettività"; Warmuth (1992, 19-20): "Die Frösche werden in den Fabeln als feige, dumm und aufgeblasen...oder sorglos und lustig angesehen." For mice, see Dawson 1925; Rowland, B., *Animals with Human Faces. A Guide to Animal Symbolism*, Knoxville: U of Tennessee P 1973, 127-129.

115 Following Winkler 1922; diametrically opposing Doderer's 'antirealism' (above, 2.3).

116 1982a, 24. The very term ("Dreigliedrigkeit") is confusing, as in the same context (ib. 23) "Zweigliedrigkeit" is used to indicate the genre's polarity.

"ohne Lehre oft unvollstandig", whereas "die Lehre ist ein zusatzlicher Schmuck, der nicht wesentlich zur Fabel gehort".[117]

According to Leibfried the functions—which he, again rather confusingly, calls "Stilzuge"—of fables can be didactic ("religios", "moralisch", or "lebensklug"), critical, satirical or "fabulos" (teaching the unchangeability of nature).[118]

Leibfried also distinguishes fable from related genres: "Marchen" are emotional, fables rational; parables allegorical, fables symbolic; "philosophische Naturgedicht[e]" lyrical, fables "episch" ("breit") or "dramatisch" ("dialogisiert"); emblems[119] and Physiologus-lore "Handlungslos[igkeit]", fables "Geschichte[n]".[120]

2.5 *Dithmar (1972, 1974, 1984)*

Dithmar[121] subsumes fable together with parable and simile as "parabolische Rede", in which a "Bildteil" (*secundum*) is analogous to a "Sachteil" (*primum*) in one or another respect (*tertium comparationis*). He compares fable with (four) other genres both within and outside this tripartite concept. On the one hand, fables do not differ fundamentally from parables[122] but do from similes, as fables deal with something past, unique and fictitious, whereas similes describe something actual, general and evident. On the other hand, parabolic speech

---

[117] 1982a, 19, 25

[118] 1982a, 35-39; cf. Perry ("wordly wisdom and shrewdness"), Adrados (nature) (above, 1 2, 1 7)

[119] Cf Biard, J D , *The Style of La Fontaine's Fables*, Oxford Blackwell 1966, 138-141, referring to Menestrier, C.F , *L'Art des Emblemes*, Paris 1684, 27-30, Tiemann 1974, Hueck 1975, Varty 1991, 8

[120] 1982a, 17-20, 30 For the *Physiologus*, cf Perry (above, 1 2) Elsewhere, however, Leibfried (35) states "Der 'Physiologus' kann als Typ der belehrend-religiosen Fabel gelten", but cf ib 50

[121] Following Julicher 1910 (who (I 98) defined fable as "die Redefigur, in welcher die Wirkung eines Satzes (Gedankens) gesichert werden soll durch Nebenstellung einer auf anderm Gebiet ablaufenden, ihrer Wirkung gewissen erdichteten Geschichte, deren Gedankengerippe dem jenes Satzes ohnlich ist ") Cf La Fontaine 1668, 35-36 with Blavier-Paquot 1964, 99, Klemm 1969, Powell 1983, 55, Beavis 1990

[122] Cf Lindner 1994, 19 Contra Lessing; Elster, E., *Prinzipien der Literaturwissenschaft*, I-II, Halle 1897-1911, Wilpert, G von, *Sprachworterbuch der Literatur*, Stuttgart 1955, 7, Kayser, W , *Das sprachliche Kunstwerk*, Bern 1956[4], 123, Seidler, H , *Die Dichtung*, Stuttgart 1959, 519, 522, Pongs, H., *Das kleine literarische Lexikon*, Stuttgart 1967[6], col 1405, Windfuhr, M [Hrsg], *Deutsche Fabeln des 18 Jahrhunderts*, Stuttgart. Reclam 1960 (repr. 1993), 127

differs from allegory, in that all elements of the latter but only one of the former refer to something else; furthermore, an allegory cannot be deciphered without a 'key', whereas the image of parabolic speech is self-explanatory.[123] Unlike parabolic speech, an *exemplum* is not metaphorical but only generalizes something particular.[124]

Dithmar[125] emphasizes that fables are didactic, not entertaining, literature. He asserts that fables, unlike "Tierepos", "Schwank", and "Märchen", are "*knapp, gezielt und pointiert*", and "episch und dramatisch zugleich".[126] He posits a quadruple basic (variable) fable format: situation—*actio*—*reactio*—result.[127] He firmly opposes[128] any restriction of fable characters, but[129] regards animals as "bevorzugte Akteure" because their nature is well-known—although they are no stereotypes, nor do they necessarily behave in accordance with Natural History—, and because they show "das Animalische" in man, and create "Verfremdung"[130]. Like Leibfried, Dithmar points to the "antithetische Bau" of fables, which confront an "Akteur" and a "*Kontrastfigur*" (Doderer's terms; above, 2.3-4).

Dithmar is apparently not acquainted with Perry's criticism of Meuli's theory (above, 1.1-2), for he contends, following the latter[131], that fables originally had a "Sitz im Leben" (e.g. LXX, *Jd.* 9.8-15 and 4 *Ki.* 14.9), which has mostly "verkümmert" to a promythium or epimythium.[132] He conceives of the genre[133] as "eingekleidete Wahr-

---

[123] Cf. Fischer (1891, 9-13), as well as Vandenberghe (above, 2.1); D. 40T14 (Melanchthon) *mira luce et perspicuitate...ante oculos...posuit.* Differently Schmalzriedt 1988, 184: "Geschichte[n] [*sc.* Fabeln], deren Geschehen eine unmittelbar einleuchtende, bei den besten Stucken aber behutsam verschwiegene allegorische Bedeutung...besitzt."

[124] 1974, 81-98.

[125] 1974, 99-114; cf. Perry (above, 1.2).

[126] Diametrically opposing Leibfried's disjunction (above, 2.4).

[127] Cf. the "four-part scheme" postulated by Gasparov (1968, 127): "'exposition, idea, action, unexpected result'"; Morocho Gayo 1994, 36.

[128] Differently Leibfried (above, 2.4). Contra Grimm 1834, p. IX.

[129] Following Lessing and Spoerri 1942/1943, 251; cf. Pannwitz 1966-1967, 53.

[130] Likewise Kreis 1974, 91. Cf. Doderer; differently Leibfried (above, 2.3-4).

[131] Taking a stand against Doderer and Leibfried (above, 2.3-4); cf. Karadagli (1981; but see above, n. 6). Elsewhere, however, Dithmar (1984, col. 735) acknowledges this theory as "umstritten". Cf. the criticism of Dithmar's theory by Gebhard (1974) and Schippers (1995, 40-42).

[132] Likewise Kreis 1974, 91-92; Schmalzriedt 1988, 184.

[133] Concurring with Spoerri 1942/1943 and Schirokauer 1953, and building on programmatic passages from Luther (M., *Etliche Fabeln aus Esopo von D.M.L. verdeudscht*, "Vorrede", 1530: "betriegen zur Warheit" (ed. Dithmar, R., *Martin Luthers Fabeln und Sprichworter*, Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft 1995², 159; see Doderer,

heit", which is "ihrem Wesen nach existenz- und gesellschaftskritisch"[134], and holds that this original socio-political function was lost when "die echte Fabel" was "verfälscht" into a "moralische Geschichte".[135]

2.6 *Ewald (1975)*

Ewald defines the genre as a relatively short, fictitious narrative with non-rational or ("seltener") rational[136] characters, which has a didactic function. In Ewald's terminology, each fable has both an "Erstsinn" (I_1, *signifiant*) and a "Zweitsinn" (I_2, *signifié*), which have a "gemeinsames Grundmuster" (I_0).[137] This analogy is apparent either from an explicit "moralité", which is introduced by typical formulae, or, more implicitly, from "Bereichsmischung des Vokabulars" (24-36).

This typical, binary structure distinguishes the genre from other "epische Kleinformen". Fairy tales, legends, anecdotes, and ("selbst") myths have only an "Erstsinn"; proverbs only a "Zweitsinn"; allegories, riddles, and parables a comparable structure (45-46).

2.7 *Grubmuller (1977, 1981, 1983; Dicke-Grubmuller 1987)*

Grubmuller distinguishes constant from optional genre elements. He conceives of fable as a fictitious story, which is "im offenkundigen Widerspruch zur Erfahrung"[138], with a "nicht-menschlich[en], aber anthopomorphisiert[en]" "Personal"[139], which is told "zu demonstra-

K., "Über das 'betriegen zur Wahrheit' Die Fabelbearbeitungen Martin Luthers", *Wirkendes Wort* 14, 1964, 379-388 [repr in Hasubek 1983a, 207-223])), Triller (D W, *Neue Äsopische Fabeln*, 1740, "Vorrede") and Lichtwer (M G, *Vier Bucher Aesopischer Fabeln in gebundener Schreibart*, Leipzig 1748, 8-9) Cf, in addition, De Florian 1792, 19, and already Babr 126 (*Aes* 355) and Phaedr *App* 5-6 (*Aes* 535), for which see Komornicka 1987

[134] Cf Kreis 1974, 59-61, contra Villwock 1986, 63, n 8

[135] 1974, 115-139, much unlike Janssens (above, 2 2)

[136] These are mentioned only in a footnote (29, n 1).

[137] Likewise Coenen 1976

[138] Cf Doderer's "anti-realistisch", unlike Leibfried's "Wirklichkeitsillusion" (above, 2 3-4)

[139] Cf Leibfried (above, 2 4), unlike whom, however, Grubmuller (1981, 130) includes "sogar Gotter sie sind [like animals, plants, objects, and the like] keine Menschen und zu menschlichen Handlungen nicht fähig" In itself, this extension of the character stock is to be endorsed, but Grubmuller's argumentation is invalidated by the Greek anthropomorphic conception of the gods

tiv-didaktischen Zwecken", and which is "auf analoge menschliche Situationen und Verhaltensweisen beziehbar". All other elements, "Pro- und/oder Epimythien, Auslegungsmodi, Situationsbezuge, inhaltliche Tendenzen affirmativer oder kritischer Art etc." are characteristic not of the genre but only of "bestimmte zeitlich begrenzte Aktualisierungsphasen".[140]

Grubmüller[141] is aware of transitions from fables to "Nachbargattungen" and *vice versa*: fables may borrow subject matter from "Naturgeschichte[n]" or aetiologies, or may, conversely, be reduced to "Sprichwörter und Sentenzen", whereas there is a reciprocity between fable and beast epic, "Tierschwank und Tiermäre". The proverbs, however, had best be included in his third, "reciprocal" category, in view of the existence of fables based upon proverbs[142].

2.8 *Lindner (1978a)*

Lindner firmly opposes both the theoretical aporia to which some scholars[143] resign themselves, and categorical fable definitions which either restrict the genre's "Personal"[144] or function (sociological[145]; exclusively didactic[146]), or assert[147] that fables should have a "Sitz im Leben" or explicit "Moral" and "Pointe". Such criteria are "historisch variable Größen" but not "konstante[n] Strukturelementen".[148]

Lindner himself[149] starts from a structuralistic-dynamic genre conception. He defines fable as "*diejenige literarische Kurzform, bei der durch (wie auch immer geartete) interpretative Zuordnung einer amimetischen, transpa-*

[140] Dicke-Grubmuller 1987, p. XXII; cf. Grubmuller 1977, 11-15, 21; 1981, 112; 1983, 476; Perry, Doderer (above, 1.2, 2.3).

[141] Dicke-Grubmuller 1987, pp. XXII-XXVI.

[142] See e.g. Christoffersson 1901, 115-128 ("ad prouerbia...fictae [*sc.* fabulae Babrianae]").

[143] Contra Perry, Doderer and Leibfried (above, 1.2, 2.3-4).

[144] Contra Leibfried (above, 2.4)

[145] Crusius 1913; Spoerri 1942/1943; Schirokauer 1953; Meuli (above, 1.1); Friederici 1965; Wilke 1971; Kreis 1974.

[146] Janssens (above, 2.2); Lindner refers to Phaedrus' creed of combining *docere* and *delectare* (G12).

[147] Like, respectively, Dithmar, Leibfried, and Doderer (above, 2.3-5).

[148] 16-23, 40; cf. Grubmuller's distinction (above, 2.7).

[149] 23-24; following Hempfer (K.W., *Gattungstheorie*, München 1973) and Kaiser (G.R., "Zur Dynamik literarischer Gattungen", in: Rudiger, H., *Die Gattungen in der Vergleichenden Literaturwissenschaft*, Berlin/New York 1974, 32-62), and like Nøjgaard (above, 1.3), who is, however, not mentioned.

renten allegorischen Erzählung auf ein Wertsystem eine oder mehrere Einsicht(en) bzw. Ansicht(en) veranschaulicht wird (bzw. werden)" (26; his italics). Lindner subsequently elaborates this definition, incorporating various structuralist theories (27-39). He describes the genre's narrative structure as a "triadische[n] Elementarsequenz"[150] of an (un)successful (c) attempt (b) to change a given situation (a). Distinguishing "Lang-" from "Kurzformen"[151], he includes fable among the latter, as each fable deals with only one "antagonistische Opposition"[152]. By "amimetisch" he means the genre's "antirealistisches Vertextungsprinzip", which hinders the reader to take "das Erzählte für ein wahrscheinliches Geschehen (im Sinne der aristotelischen Mimesis-Konzeption)".[153] This "Entwirklichung" can be achieved either by means of a gradual "anthropomorphe Verwendung irrealer Handlungsträger" (including personifications and gods), or, in fables with exclusively human protagonists, (1)—on the level of the *histoire*[154]—by means of elements which "den jeweils herrschenden weltanschaulich-kulturell konditionierten Wirklichkeitsvorstellungen und Verhaltensnormen eklatant zuwiderlaufen" or by systematically showing all "Handlungsmöglichkeiten" "von einer gegebenen Rollenkonstellation" (e.g. *Aes.* 725), or (2)—on the level of the *discours*—by "Typisierung": time and place adjuncts are vague or lacking altogether, and the protagonists are *flat characters*[155]. Finally, he describes[156] the fable—unlike the parable and "Gleichniserzählung", which are 'totally' or 'coherently'

---

[150] 27-28, adopting Bremond's *séquence élémentaire* (C., "La logique des possibles narratifs", *Communications* 8, 1966, 60-76; *Logique du récit*, Paris 1973; criticism by Scheerer, Th.M.-Winkler, M., "Zum Versuch einer universalen Erzählgrammatik bei Claude Bremond", *Poetica* 8, 1976, 1-24).

[151] On the principle of Lammert, E., *Bauformen des Erzählens*, Stuttgart 1955, but unlike Nøjgaard (above, 1.3).

[152] Lindner borrows this notion from Link, J., *Literaturwissenschaftliche Grundbegriffe*, München 1974.

[153] 31, joining Doderer and Leibfried (above, 2.3-4); cf. Nøjgaard's *allégorie mécanique* (1.3).

[154] For "histoire" and "discours", Lindner refers to Todorov, T., "Les catégories du récit littéraire", *Communications* 8, 1966, 125-151; Genette, G., "Frontières du récit", ibid. 152-163; Stierle, K., "Geschehen, Geschichte, Text der Geschichte", in *Text als Handlung*, Munchen 1975, 49-55.

[155] Lindner refers to Forster, E.M., *Aspects of the Novel*, London 1927, and compares the concept of "Eindimensionalitat" which Doderer borrowed from Lüthi (see above, 2.3).

[156] Adopting Plett's concept of allegory (H., *Einführung in die rhetorische Textanalyse*, Hamburg 1973²); contra Dithmar (above, 2.5).

allegorical—as a 'mixed' allegory, in which "Verweisungszeichen" "zwischen den beiden Sinnebenen"[157] make the analogy between fable and "(außertextliche) Pragmatik" evident, both in a particular "Kommunikationssituation" and "situationslos" (in collections). Here Lindner seems to ignore a third possibility, viz. fables used in *textual* situations (like those investigated in the present dissertation).

If the balance between these structural elements is upset, Lindner argues, transitions may occur from fables to "Nachbargattungen", e.g. epigram and aphorism (shorter), beast epic (longer), "phantastische Kurzgeschichte" (more amimetic), *exemplum* or *conte* (less so) (40-41). But here Lindner's dynamic structuralism appparently makes him forget that there are yet other differences between fables and these genres: the first three mentioned above are not "amimetic", the latter three not "allegorical" (to apply his own terms).

2.9 *Blackham (1985)*

Blackham acknowledges "main dependence on the scholarship of... Perry for *Aesopica*"[158], but differs fundamentally from the latter in that his genre conception is much broader—one might say: rather vague—, as he subsumes both "Aesopic" and "longer fables"—fiction like Lucian's *True History*, Swift's *Gulliver's Travels*, and Orwell's *Animal Farm*—under one heading.

Blackham again starts from (Perry's interpretation of) Theon's definition of a fable (G20a, c) as "a fictitious story picturing a truth" (p. XI). He specifies that this 'truth' is (1) "something shown not something said", as he feels that "Aesopic fables must be shorn of intrusive promythia or epimythia", which implies that the reader's "collaboration" is called for and relied on, and (2) "something of general import and importance not generally or not sufficiently recognized".[159] The metaphor of a fable is "incongruous", as it "opens the mind", and "conceptually constructive" ("logical"), not "expressive" ("stylistic"; as in poetry): "poetry has no message; fable has nothing else." (238, 250) This schematism is an oversimplification, as fables may in their turn include 'stylistic' metaphors.[160] The reason

[157] Cf. Wienert's "Erzahlungsseite" and "Sinnseite" (1925, 20).
[158] P. X; for Perry, see above, 1.2.
[159] 175, 236-239, 253.
[160] E.g. Nic. 3F1 ἐμφλέγεται, καύσῳ, κεκαυμένος; Arist. 39F2 πεινῶντες.

for telling a fable is either "tactical, a need for concealment", or "philosophical, development of thought" (209).

Blackham strongly opposes other conceptions of the genre. He deems the social approach advocated by Meuli *et alii* "inappropriate to the content, purpose and history of fable", as the genre's "meanings [note the plural] are open to reflection, in a sense in which the meaning of a proposition is not"[161]. Likewise, he holds that "satire is incidental to the narrative in fables, seldom its purpose".[162] Nor is a fable "a didactic story", as fables "are more descriptive than prescriptive".[163] He observes that "the animals in fables are not beasts of the field", "but neither are they stereotypes".[164]

Blackham (184-192) makes several distinctions between fables and related genres. Unlike fables, myths have "a communal character" and "are accepted as true", although "a particular myth, as story, may be used as a fable", since "the type of story is not a criterion. The use made of it is".[165] "Fable is independent and general, parable particular and *ad hoc*."[166] Blackham, however, conceives of fable solely as a "particular concrete representation" of "a general 'truth'"[167], without regard to fables illustrating a 'particular truth' (to use Perry's words). Folktales and fairy tales "are devised as entertainment", whereas fables have a "utilitarian purpose" (238). Allegory is a "sequence of metaphors, fable is a metaphorical action." He also points to the "natural bond between Aesopic fables and proverbs" (212).

2.10 *Vater Solomon (1985a)*

Vater Solomon defines fable as "a simple unreal type of oral or written tale, featuring animals or plants, told to reinforce some moral

---

[161] 243. For Meuli, see above, 1.1; cf. the criticism by Gumbrecht, H.U., "Fabeln und literaturwissenschaftliches Erkenntnisinteresse. Vorschlage zum Umgang mit dem *Esope* der Marie de France in hermeneutischer Absicht", in: *Marie de France. Äsop*, Munchen: Fink 1973, 22-23.

[162] Cf. Janssens (above, 2.2); but see Adrados (1.7).

[163] P. XI, 251; cf. Sternberger 1941, 21; Schafer 1955, 70: "Der Welt Lauf". Differently Doderer (above, 2.3); Hassauer 1986, 16, on French Enlightenment fables.

[164] 11. Cf. Doderer, Dithmar (above, 2.3, 2.5); differently Leibfried (above, 2.4). Elsewhere, however, Blackham (203) states that "the animals of Aesop" do have "stereotyped reputations".

[165] P. XVII. Cf. Jedrkiewicz (above, 1.8); differently Adrados (1.7).

[166] Cf. Fischer 1891, 18.

[167] 112; cf. Koep (above, 1.4).

teaching or to satirize political[168] leaders." She admits that "fables may also include humans and...the deity as well"—note the monotheistic singular—but, somewhat artificially, restricts the latter to "*another* society's deity". She rather feels that these characters (human beings and the deity) are typical of parables[169] and allegories, which "are also subtler forms of teaching values, the parable pointing from one known reality to a more mysterious one, and the allegory drawing direct connections between two whole realms of associations."[170] She shares Blackham's broad genre conception by calling Orwell a "political fabulist".[171]

Vater Solomon observes that "fables may also contain matters of an aetiological nature". She distinguishes fables from animal tales by stating that, unlike the former, the latter are amoral.[172] Her plea to inquire into "the context, or specific social situation, in which the fable is told and employed", including "the type of narrator and audience", "the purpose and tone of the fable", and "the circumstances" and "style" "of its narration", may serve as a motto to the present dissertation (116). However, her subsequent discrimination, extrapolating from two Biblical plant fables[173], between the functions of animal and plant fables as "largely" social and political, respectively, is too dogmatic.[174]

2.11 *Hassauer (1986)*

Hassauer describes fable as a bipartite "Sprachhandlungsschema", which consists of a fictitious, 'diachronic', "Narratio" and a real, 'a-

---

[168] Cf. again Koep (above, 1.4), as well as Coats 1981, 374.

[169] Cf. Jacobs 1889, I 204sqq (contra: Smith 1915, 526); Wünsche 1905, 1; Wicher 1923 contra Lessing 1759; Gordon 1960, 139, n. 121; Zymner 1991, 145-146. Differently McMahon 1927, 1.3: "unlike the fable the beast of the parable is never given human attributes, but always remains true to its kind."

[170] 115, 119; cf. Vandenberghe and (for the allegory, not the parable) Dithmar (above, 2.1; 2.5).

[171] 120; cf. above, 2.9. Likewise Dodds 1959, 269; Grimaldi 1988, 252; Fergenson, L., "George Orwell's *Animal Farm*: A Twentieth-Century Beast Fable", *Bestia* 2, 1990, 109-118; Zymner 1991, 151. Vater Solomon (lc) informs her readers also about a *Roman de Renart* by Jean de La Fontaine!

[172] Contra Krappe 1929, 60-69; differently Jedrkiewicz (above, 1.8).

[173] 121-123, joining Krappe 1929, 68. LXX, *Jd.* 9.8-15; 2 *Ki.* 14.8-14, 2 *Ch.* 25.17-24.

[174] Counterexamples: Arist. 39F2 (a political animal fable) and Call. 20F2 (a non-political plant fable).

chronic', "Adfabulatio" ("Promythion, Epimythion oder impliziter Moralité" (55)). The *Narratio* is characterized by interaction of the protagonists, the *Adfabulatio* by interaction of the author and the reader, or of the narrator and the addressee (53). Hassauer's schematism, however, accounts neither for fables featuring only one protagonist (e.g. A. 12F1; cf. Adrados' *fábula de situación*), nor for those fables occurring *outside* collections which do not metaphorically represent both the narrator and the addressee.[175]

According to Hassauer, animal characters are "bevorzugt".[176] She considers the genre's function to be didactic. Its typical combination of *delectare et prodesse* serves as "die süße Hülle für die bittere Pille" (26). Fables were traditionally used to describe "die Welt, wie sie ist", but later (in the Age of Reason), rather, to *pre*scribe "wie sie sein soll".[177]

2.12 *Pawate (1986)*

Pawate defines fable as "a short narrative" "followed by a moral lesson", which is "mostly secular and nonethical"[178] and "always told in the form of a proverb" (which is overstating the reciprocity between fable and proverb). The author notes that human beings and "supernatural beings" "sometimes" occur as fable characters (which is an understatement). He tries (but fails) to distinguish fables clearly from parables and tales (31-32). Terming the genre a "Pocket-mini-Theatre"[179], he states that the "Aristotelian principles [as expounded in his *Poetics*] are represented in miniature in [and, Pawate fancies, derived by Aristotle from] the fables of Aesop. They have a beginning, a middle and an end. They are also governed by the Three Unities—of Time, Place and Action [*quod non*[180]]." Pawate thinks that

---

[175] See above, Adrados (1.7), and the Final Conclusion below, subsection 2.1 (Analogy), respectively.

[176] Cf. Dithmar (above, 2.5).

[177] 16. However, elsewhere (35): "Die didaktische Verfahren der traditionellen Fabel sind präskriptiv".

[178] 15, 26, 29, 85. Cf. Perry; Koep (above, 1.2; 1.4). Differently Schwarzbaum (1979, pp. XIII-XVIII), discussing "Theodicy Fables Conveying a Lesson in Divine Justice" and "Fables Employed as an Exegetical Medium".

[179] 33; cf. Doderer (above, 2.3).

[180] 111, cf. 86, 106. Pawate states (87) that "the action is...not exceeding twenty-four hours", which is obviously not always the case, e.g. Ps.-Dos. 12 (*fab. aes.* 312 Hausrath; *Aes.* 384): μετὰ δὲ τρεῖς ἡμέρας. *Mutatis mutandis*, the same applies to

some fables included in the collections are not fables but proverbs, riddles, fairy tales, or anecdotes (87), and remarks that some fables are aetiological (90).

2.13 *Knauth (1988ab)*

Knauth declares Lindner's definition to be "la plus adéquate parmi celles élaborées jusqu'à présent"[181], if only to falsify it by arguing—if not always convincingly—that no element of his definition is indispensable. First, Knauth notes that in fables consisting of mere dialogues[182] the narrative element is apparently absent—implicit, Lindner[183] himself observed. Knauth rightly comments upon Lindner's second and third criteria, adducing fables which are not relatively short or amimetic (for not obviously fictitious). Knauth predominantly draws his examples from modern fabulists, but could have exemplified his criticism with ancient fables as well, as the collections have already been seen (by Perry; above, 1.2) to contain both stories featuring historical characters and items which are not even stories, whereas longer fables do occur both in and outside the collections[184]. Finally, Knauth's commenting[185] upon the presence of a promythium or epimythium is, though pertinent in itself, somewhat like tilting at windmills, as Lindner would probably agree.

After having deconstructed Lindner's theory—reducing it to a "*fabula rasa*"—, Knauth presents his own insights in an elaborate scheme, devised to do justice to the rich fable tradition by subdividing all genre characteristics into two alternatives. Some of these alternatives are of equal value ("neutral"; e.g. the presence or absence of an explicit "Moral", or the age of the audience), but in other cases

Pawate's assertion (ibid.) that "it takes place in only one place", cf. e.g. *Vit. Aesop.* 133G (another version of the same fable; cf. *fab. aes.* 302 Hausrath): εἰσήγαγεν αὐτὸν εἰς ταμιεῖον—ἀπήγαγεν δὲ αὐτὸν εἰς λίμνην.

[181] 1988a, 319; for Lindner, see above, 2.8.

[182] E.g. Willamov, J.G., *Dialogische Fabeln in zwey Büchern*, 1765. Leibfried (1982, 30), however, remarks that "die dialogisierte Form zeigt besonders deutlich das Grundschema jeder Fabel"; cf. Hirzel 1895, I 339; Schmalzriedt 1988, 184.

[183] 1978, 27, n. 63.

[184] Notably Call. 20F2, (Enn. *ap.*) Gell. G31, Hor. *S.* 2.6.79-117 (see below, Aug. G63, n. 147), Apu. *De deo Socr. prol.* 4 (adduced as *exemplum dilatati apologi* by Erasm. *Cop.* 2 (p. 256 Knott) and Lorichius 1542, 16-20); Babr. 95 (*Aes.* 336; 102 choliambs), Him. G56; cf. e.g. Rom. Mon. 35-36, 39; *fab. extr.* 2-6; for modern examples, cf. e.g. Wilhelm 1994, 233, on Russian "expansive fabular forms".

[185] 1988a, 334-335.

Knauth distinguishes "primary" and "secondary" alternatives. Primary alternatives may be with or without "extreme Dominanz"; secondary alternatives associatively include—"in der Verneinung"—their primary counterpart "als Nullkonstituent", "z.B. die Assoziation von Tierfabeln bei der Realisierung von Menschenfabeln".[186]

In itself, Knauth's genre conception[187] is very flexible, enabling him to remark, for instance, that fable characters are primarily "antagonistisch", without having to negate the existence of fables in which the characters are not. The idea of "associated zero constituents", however, seems to apply to fable *collections* rather than to fables occurring in other literary genres (such as those collected in the present book). The same can be said of his statement that the "Sinnsachverhalt" of fables is constantly abstract.[188] Finally, some of his (admittedly hypothetical) distinctions are debatable, particularly his assertions that the genre's functions are primarily critical and moral, and that its use as "Exempel in Situationen" is secondary. The former assertion omits more neutral, explanatory/illustrative functions, whereas the latter is obviously invalid for Archaic and Classical Greek (as well as for Republican Latin) literature.[189]

2.14 *Liebchen (1990, 1992)*

Liebchen opposes the "Beckmesserei einseitiger Fabeltheoretiker". His own theorizing, however, is mainly an *Auseinandersetzung* with Lessing's 1759 *Abhandlungen*[190].

As "Formkriterien" Liebchen[191] posits three "Prinzipien": (1) "des Mittels", consisting of three "Verfremdungseffekten"[192]: (a) "schnelle

[186] 1988b, 77-78.

[187] Building on Fricke's model (H., *Norm und Abweichung. Eine Philosophie der Literatur*, Munchen 1981), and referring to his own *Invarianz und Variabilität literarischer Texte*, Amsterdam 1981.

[188] Cf. Blackham (above 2.9), but see the Final Conclusion, subsection 2.2 below ("Function").

[189] See the General Introduction above.

[190] For which see rather: Grebel 1876; Fischer 1891; Weddigen 1893, 5-17, 24-26; Wienert 1925, 5-6; Staege 1929, 35-44; Markschies 1954/1955; Ott 1959; Klemm 1969; Nøjgaard 1964, 30-32; Briegel-Florig 1965, 57-62; Dithmar 1974, 58-61; Eichner 1974 (especially 361-400); Noel 1975, 85-101; Hippe 1981, 12-13; Villwock 1986; Schrader 1991, 89-108, as well as Bauer 1973 and Hasubek, P., "Der Erzähler in den Fabeln Lessings", 1980, in: id. 1983a, 363-383.

[191] 1990, 108-128.

[192] Cf. Dithmar (above, 2.5).

Charakterisierung" by using exclusively non-human characters (unlike parables and jokes)[193], (b) "Unterlegenheit der Akteure", (c) showing "das Allgemeine...in dem Besondern"[194], (2) "des Zwecks": "Verständnis", and (3) "des Ziels": "Erkenntnis" effecting "verandertes Verhalten" (unlike "Gleichnis"). Liebchen's genre conception is as vague as Blackham's and Vater Solomon's (above, 2.9-10): he, too, includes "Orwells Fabel 'Farm der Tiere'".

Liebchen discusses various "Irrwege der Fabeleinteilungen"—among other ones, Herder's and Lessing's, mere modifications of Aphthonius' classification (G54; q.v.), which Liebchen does not recognize—, but at the same time rigidly divides the genre into "rhetorische" and "epische Fabeln", each with its own public ("Hörer" versus "Leser") and purpose ("agitatorisch" versus "paränetisch"), and somewhat gratuitously subdivides the former into "Diskurs-", "Aktions-" and "Diskurs-Aktions-Fabel".[195] He takes Lessing's notion of "anschauende Erkenntnis" to imply that fables cannot possibly be used to *conceal* the truth diplomatically, but does not see that these two aspects are not incompatible at all as fables do constitute an indirect way of speaking.[196]

Liebchen maintains that "rhetorische Fabel" and "Witz" are similar in that both "die Wirklichkeit auf die Pointe bringen"; he even argues that the first "Witz" was one of Lessing's fables.[197] He also asserts: "Die Behauptung, die Fabel sei allegorisch, ist Unsinn", since "ein abstrakter Begriff ... beispielsweise ... 'der Krieg' als Fabelakteur ... widerspricht ganz den Intentionen der Fabel".[198] This assertion, however, is untenable. In the first place, Liebchen confuses allegory with personification. What is more, personifications do occur as fable characters, e.g. War and Insolence in Theopompus (35F1), Truth and Falsehood in *Aes.* 355 and 535![199] *Mutatis mutandis*, the same

---

193 Cf. Leibfried and Grubmüller (parables); Vater Solomon (jokes) (above, 2.4, 2.7, 2.10).

194 Lessing 1759; cf. Blackham (above, 2.9).

195 1990, 136-161; 1992, 116-124; cf. Knauth (above, 2.13), but see above, n. 182.

196 See Meuli and Blackham (above, 1.1, 2.9), as well as Phaedr. G14 and Jul. G50.

197 1.4: "Der Esel und das Jagdpferd"; Liebchen 1990, 167-188.

198 1992, 113; unlike Nøjgaard, García Gual, Vandenberghe, Lindner (above, 1.3, 1.6, 2.1, 2.8).

199 References given below, Theopomp. Hist. 35F1, n. 54.

applies to Liebchen's assertion that "Akteure[n]...mit unbestimmten Artikel" and indefinite time adjuncts in fables are "Unsinn" and "stilistisch schlecht".[200]

2.15 *Carnes (1992a)*

Carnes defines "three clear-cut characteristics of the fable that are absolutely essential. These are: 1) it is a short narrative, with a fairly standard structural format; 2) it generally contains a single motif or narrative type or a short concatenation of simple motifs; and 3) it is an implicit or explicit general metaphor (generally explicit in its more modern forms [with which Carnes is particularly dealing], as a 'moral' tag line or epimythium), that is instructive, prescriptive, descriptive, and paraenetic."[201] Drawing attention to the frequency of human beings as fable characters, he distinguishes "fable" from "animal story", and points to "intersections" of fables with fairy tales, proverbs, and jokes.[202]

2.16 *Carlson (1993)*

Carlson, (rightly) objecting to Blackham's vague use of terminology, and refining Ziolkowski[203], defines fable as a "*short past-tense fictional narrative that invites perception of a point about how to live life.*"[204] Carlson observes that Ziolkowski misinterprets Perry by considering "the explicit presence of a moral" to be "the chief distinguishing feature of Aesopic fable". On the other hand, however, Carlson, too, seems to misunderstand Perry when stating that the latter restricts the genre's purpose to the illustration of "an ethical truth".[205] Carlson holds that fables, jokes, and parables are "structurally identical" but different in

---

[200] 1992, 108; see, however, the observations by Adrados, Doderer and Lindner (above, 1.7, 2.3, 2.8), and cf., e.g., the *adverbia (temporalia) indefinita* listed in the Final Conclusion below.

[201] 6-7; differently García Gual (above, 1.6).

[202] 8-9. Cf. Meuli (above, 1.1); Alsina 1978.

[203] For Ziolkowski, see above, 1.2; for Blackham, 2.9; cf. Vater Solomon, Liebchen (2.10, 2.14).

[204] 11, 17-18; joining Perry and Carnes (above, 1.2, 2.15).

[205] 8-10. Differently Pawate (above, 2.10). Perry's words (1959, 19) are somewhat misleading indeed, but he has been seen (above, 1.2) to find that fables are descriptive rather than prescriptive.

effect: jokes "point out some of the incongruity of life", parables "invite[s] reconsideration of values".[206]

2.17 *Parussa (1993)*

Parussa, showing some caution, defines fable as a "récit bref, mettant en scène le plus souvent des animaux, plus rarement des hommes, des dieux, ou des objets inanimés" with "un but didactique ou une valeur exemplaire, qui se révèle dans la morale, toujours exprimée à la fin ou au début de la fable."[207]

2.18 *Hasubek (1996)*

In a recent lemma of the *Historisches Wörterbuch der Rhetorik*, Hasubek does not define fable, but confines its characters to animals, plants, and objects; fables featuring gods are rather like short myths. As for the genre's function, he states that fables combine a didactic and an entertaining element, one of which may be stressed, and that they are often critical and satirical.

He also compares fable with some related genres, using the genre's "Inventar" as a criterion. In fairy tales and animal stories, which are told for mere entertainment, the animals are not used metaphorically (as in fables); in parables, animals and plants do not occur as characters at all. When adding that parables need a key to be deciphered, however, he seems to confuse parable with allegory, for which one might refer to Dithmar (above, 2.5).

Hasubek considers fables to be dualistic (two rival (groups of) characters representing two different points of view) and quadripartite ("Ausgangssituation"—*actio*—*reactio*—*conclusio* ("Lehre", an abstraction from the concrete story)), but points out that one of these parts (notably the fourth) may be left out. In addition, he remarks that fables are universal; their audience varies from young to old, from lower classes to high society.[208]

[206] 10, 12. Cf. Vandenberghe, Dithmar (parables), Liebchen (jokes) (above, 2.1, 2.5, 2.14).

[207] 13; cf. Janssens (above, 2.2).

[208] Cf. Wilhelm 1994, 22, on Russian seventeenth- and eighteenth-century fables.

Conclusion

Considering the twenty-seven theories reviewed above *en groupe* might appear to be a labyrinthine undertaking, due to the wide diversity—not decreased by the apparent ignorance of some of meritorious insights of others—of their basic assumptions, points of special interest, and lines of approach. Different types of static fable definitions[209] alternate, or are combined, with mutually divergent dynamic genre conceptions[210], but the latter seem, broadly speaking, more appropriate, in view of the genre's historical multiformity[211]. Following this thread, we may find a way out.

The heterogeneity of the collections is problematic to most theoreticians, to the extent that some resign themselves to a theoretical aporia[212], some eliminate part of the items included[213], whereas others do observe a thematical or structural unity in the disparate corpus.[214] However, the first, "aporetic", solution is unilluminating, whereas the second, "analytical" one entails either making oversophisticated distinctions or taking draconian measures (see the next paragraph). Therefore, the third, "unitarian", position (going beyond Perry's "Erzählfreude") is preferable.

This implies that neither the characters—neither absolutely nor relatively—nor the function(s) of the fable (let alone its length) should be restricted[215]. Yet, some theoreticians[216] do categorically exclude rational fable characters (humans and/or gods), whereas others[217] impose certain limitations to their presence. The latter restrictions,

[209] E.g. Nøjgaard; Leibfried (above, 1.3; 2.4).
[210] Lindner, Knauth (above, 2.8, 2.13).
[211] See Perry, Adrados (above, 1.2, 1.7).
[212] Perry, Koep; Doderer, Leibfried (above, 1.2, 1.4; 2.3-4). Le Monnier (G.-A., *Fables, contes et épîtres*, Paris 1773, pp. V-VI; see Noel 1975, 137-138; Pascal 1995, 21), De Florian (1792, 8; Pascal 1992, 180), Küster (1970, I 5), and Küppers (1977, 210-211) take the same position; cf. Bieber 1906, 6-8.
[213] Ziolkowski, Nøjgaard; Pawate (above, 1.2-3; 2.12). Cf. Wienert 1925, 34-41: "Ausgesonderte Stücke".
[214] Thematical: Adrados; Blackham (above, 1.7; 2.9). Structural: Jedrkiewicz, Holzberg; Carnes (1.8-9; 2.15). Cf. Van Dijk 1997, 107. Differently Bompaire 1958, 452, postulating "interpénétration" "entre...différentes sortes de recueils".
[215] Holzberg; Vandenberghe, Dithmar (above, 1.9; 2.1, 2.5).
[216] Josifović; Leibfried, Grubmüller, Liebchen, Hasubek (above, 1.5; 2.4, 2.7, 2.14, 2.18). Likewise Chvostov (see Rammelmeyer 1939, 107), Lüthi (1962, 12), and Nuchelmans (1976). But see Carnes (2.15).
[217] Nøjgaard, Adrados; Doderer, Ewald, Vater Solomon, Pawate (above, 1.3, 1.7; 2.3, 2.6, 2.10, 2.12).

however, are artificial, whereas the former imply the exclusion of the greater part of the collections, a drastic application of modern standards to ancient concepts which is even *a priori* unlikely. At the same time, the importance of non-rational fable characters[218] should not be *over*emphasized.

Also, some theoreticians state that the genre's function is *per se* sociological, moral, or didactic.[219] Other theoreticians, however, object that these restrictions are not only extrapolations of more or less frequent—in themselves undeniable[220]—historical manifestations[221], but that they also, more particularly, disregard the fact that fables are descriptive rather than prescriptive[222].

Some theoreticians[223] underline that the question of length is of minor importance. Although the lion's share of the extant corpus is short[224], the existence of longer fables should not be negated.[225]

Some theoreticians[226] hold that fables should have a promythium or an epimythium, others[227] that they definitely should not. Again others[228], however, emphasize that the presence of such an explicit statement before or after a fable is to be considered to be optional, especially in view of the genre's graphicality. It might be remarked that the word "moral", used by some[229] to indicate the promythium

---

[218] Janssens, Hassauer, Knauth, Parussa (above, 2.2, 2.11, 2.13, 2.17).

[219] Sociological: Meuli; Dithmar (above, 1.1; 2.5). Moral: García Gual; Vandenberghe (1.6; 2.1). Didactic: Janssens, Ewald, Hassauer (2.2, 2.6, 2.11); cf. Grubmüller (2.7); likewise Provenzo 1976, 2.

[220] Contra Janssens, Dithmar, Blackham, Liebchen (above, 2.2, 2.5, 2.9, 2.14).

[221] Perry; Lindner (above, 1.1, 2.8).

[222] García Gual; Blackham; cf. Hassauer (above, 1.6; 2.9, 2.11).

[223] Nøjgaard (above, 1.3).

[224] Koep, García Gual; Janssens, Ewald, Lindner, Pawate, Carnes, Carlson, Parussa (above, 1.4, 1.6; 2.2, 2.6, 2.8, 2.12, 2.15, 2.17). Cf. Smith 1915, 529; Galli 1978, 1.

[225] Jedrkiewicz; Knauth (above, 1.8; 2.13). Cf. Erasm. *Cop.* 2 (p. 256 Knott) *fusius ac latius narrare licebit* [sc. *apologum*].

[226] Ziolkowski (but see Carlson), Josifović, Adrados, Jedrkiewicz; Janssens; cf. Hassauer (above, 1.2, 1.5, 1.7-8; 2.2, 2.16). Cf. La Fontaine 1668, 37: "Le corps est la fable, l'âme, la moralité"; Thite 1984, 39.

[227] Blackham (above, 2.9).

[228] Doderer, Ewald, Grubmüller, Lindner, Knauth, Hasubek (above, 2.3, 2.6-8, 2.13, 2.18); cf. Perry, Nøjgaard (1.2-3); Rubin 1991, 12.

[229] Jedrkiewicz; Janssens, Knauth (above, 1.8; 2.2, 2.13); cf. Ewald, Hassauer (2.6, 2.11); La Penna 1961; Nuchelmans 1976; Butts 1986, 279; Brummack 1987, 253, n. 9. Although one could point to the use of *moralitas* and *moralisatio* (see the next chapter, n. 196), Rubin's more neutral "statement" and "exposition" (1991, 12) are preferable; cf. Erasm. *Cop.* 2 (p. 256 Knott), Lorichius (1542, 12): *apologi interpretatio[nem]*.

or epimythium, is ill-chosen, as it presupposes (and extrapolates) a moral function of the genre (for which see above).

Although some theoreticians[230] raise objections, others[231] observe that indefinite time[232] and place adjuncts and unspecified characters are typical (if certainly not indispensable) formal fable elements.

The genre's typical dualism, which is pointed out by many theoreticians[233], should not be made absolute[234], as many variations may occur (notably the appearance of a *survenant*[235]). Likewise, whereas some theoreticians[236] postulate a quadripartite narrative structure, others[237] prefer to depart from a tripartite, but variable basis (introduction—action—conclusion).

The problems of definition partially originate in (or are at least increased by) the proximity of fable and several other (sub)genres, and transitions from one to another.[238] Some theoreticians, however, do propound workable distinctions: fables are past-tense stories, comparisons, similes and animal descriptions are not[239]; fables are metaphorical, animal stories, fairy tales and (historical) *exempla* are not[240]; fables are fictitious, myths are not (at least not in the same sense)[241]; fables are graphical, whereas allegories need an exegesis[242] (therefore, the term "allegorical", used by some[243] to describe the metaphorical character of fables, is confusing). A fundamental difference between fable and parable does not exist[244]. Some theoreticians[245] distinguish

---

230 Nøjgaard; Liebchen (above, 1.3, 2.14).

231 Adrados; Doderer, Lindner (above, 1.7; 2.3, 2.8).

232 Cf. the *incipits* of French fables studied by Gaillard 1996, 299-302.

233 Nøjgaard: "le plus faible—le plus fort"; Adrados: "agonal"; Jedrkiewicz: "rovesciamento"; Doderer: "Kontrastfiguren"; Dithmar: "antithetisch"; Knauth: "antagonistisch"; Hasubek: "dualistisch" (above, 1.3, 1.7-8; 2.3, 2.5, 2.13, 2.18).

234 Knauth (above, 2.13). Contra Leibfried (2.4).

235 See Nøjgaard, Adrados (above, 1.3, 1.7).

236 Dithmar, Hasubek (above, 2.5, 2.18).

237 Nøjgaard, García Gual, Adrados, Holzberg; Lindner, cf. Pawate (above, 1.3, 1.6-7, 1.9; 2.12). Leibfried's, Dithmar's, and Liebchen's tripartitions (2.4-5, 2.14) are heterogeneous.

238 Cf. Van Dijk 1997, 102-106.

239 Perry; Leibfried, Dithmar (above, 1.2; 2.4-5).

240 Animal stories: cf. Meuli; Grubmüller, Carnes (above, 1.1; 2.7). Fairy tales: García Gual; Hasubek (1.6; 2.18); cf. Ewald (2.6). *Exempla*: Perry; Dithmar (1.2; 2.5).

241 Koep, Jedrkiewicz (above, 1.4, 1.8).

242 Dithmar, Blackham (above, 2.5, 2.9).

243 Nøjgaard, García Gual; Vandenberghe, Janssens, Lindner (above, 1.3, 1.6; 2.1-2, 2.8). Cf. Freytag 1985-1986: "Die Fabel als Allegorie".

244 Dithmar, Ewald (above, 2.5-6). Cf. Courtney 1993, 16, 18.

245 Meuli, Nøjgaard (above, 1.1, 1.3).

fable and aetiology, but others[246] acknowledge the existence of aetiological fables. Furthermore, some point to the reciprocity of fable and proverb[247], and of fable and beast epic[248]. There are exceptions to some of these "rules"[249]; but this is not to say that there are no rules at all.

---

[246] Perry, Adrados, Jedrkiewicz, Holzberg; Vandenberghe, Vater Solomon, Pawate (above, 1.2, 1.7-9; 2.1, 2.10, 2.12); cf. Grubmuller (2.7).

[247] Adrados (above, 1.7). Cf. Otto 1890, p. XXV; Wienert 1925, 24-25; Vindt 1927, 99, n. 1. This is not to say that Easterling (1989a, 140) is right in calling "the fable" "a species of proverb" (cf. Luc. Tarrh. G21).

[248] Grubmuller (above, 2.7). Cf. Elschenbroich 1986, 32-33; Varty 1991, 8-9; Hasubek 1996, col. 187; differently Fischer 1891, 36.

[249] See Perry; Knauth (above, 1.2; 2.13).

ANCIENT THEORY

> οἱ δὲ λέγοντες τοὺς μὲν [*sc.* τῶν μύθων] ἐπὶ τοῖς ἀλόγοις ζώοις συγκειμένους τοιούσδε εἶναι, τοὺς δὲ ἐπ' ἀνθρώποις τοιούσδε, τοὺς μὲν ἀδυνάτους τοιούσδε, τοὺς δὲ δυνατῶν ἐχομένους τοιούσδε, εὐήθως μοι ὑπολαμβάνειν δοκοῦσιν· ἐν πᾶσι γὰρ τοῖς προειρημένοις εἰσὶν ἅπασαι αἱ ἰδέαι. (Theon, G21c)

This chapter presents an analysis of the ancient Greek and Latin testimonies on the definition and function(s) of the fable, to gain an insight into the contemporary concept of the genre.[1] Passages bearing solely on Aesop's legendary life are left out of account. Later Byzantine Greek and Medieval Latin testimonies, as well as passages containing only implicit information on fables in general, or dealing with only one fable in particular, are relegated to the notes. Terminological questions will be discussed in the next chapter. The testimonies will first pass under separate review (in chronological order) and then be compared in a conclusion. For the sake of convenience, an overview of the testimonies is given in the Synopsis below.

G1a Ar. *V.* 566 (cf. Hsch. G69a)

In Aristophanes' *Wasps* Philocleon lists the telling of a comical fable (Αἰσώπου[2] τι γέλοιον[3]) among the many improper means used by the accused to soften their judges.

[1] Previous (but partial) studies: De Gennaro-Ferrigni 1899, 1-5; Bieber 1906, 2-6; Archibald 1912, 15-28; Bolte-Polívka 1912-1932, IV 41sqq ("Märchen"); Steiner 1938, 11-17; Peters 1946, 30-32, 58-63; Kovacs 1950, 47-67; Nøjgaard 1964, 27-29; García Gual 1978a, 158-159; Adrados 1979a, 36-39; Mombello 1987, 175-179; Freytag 1985, 70-77; Demandt 1991, 398-399; Van Dijk 1993a, 1993d, 1995a; Morocho Gayo 1994, 19-20. Staege (1929, 3-18) and Freytag (1985, 77-102; cf. Heijbroek 1941, 24-25; Schippers 1995, 94-114) discuss medieval, Enenkel (1993) humanist testimonies.

[2] The scholiast falls wide of the mark: οὗτος ὁ Lh Αἴσωπος τραγῳδίας ποιητὴς {V}Γ ἐγένετο ὑποκριτὴς (ἧς) VΓLhAld γελοιώδης. VLhAld Αἰσχύλου δὲ ἦν ὑποκριτής. VLh. See Bentley 1699, 224; Koster, W.J.W., "Aesopus poeta tragicus?", *Mnemosyne IV*ᵃ *s.*, 24, 1971, 391-392; cf. Achelis 1913, 436-437.

[3] Three points plea for an identification of fables with such γέλοια (thus Bentley 1699, 224; Grebel 1876, 23; Josifović 1961, 112; Adrados 1979a, 27-28, 247) instead of with μύθους (thus Wienert 1925, 21; Meuli 1954a, 745-746, interpreting γέλοια as

G1b Ar. *V.* 1183-1185 (cf. Σ G67a)

Bdelycleon points out to his father, who, misunderstanding him[4], had started to tell him a fable (Ar. 17F1), that it is clumsy to tell fables to gentlemen.[5]

G1c Ar. *V.* 1256-1261 (cf. Σ G67b)

Bdelycleon notices that the telling of a witty, comical, Aesopic or Sybaritic fable (see the next chapter, 4.1, 5.8), one of those learned at the symposium, can appease angry fellow-guests by provoking laughter, and thus dispels his father's fear for full payment of damages, should he get drunk (which he will).

G1d Ar. *V.* 1393-1394

Philocleon trusts—as his son told him (G1c)[6]—that clever fables will reconcile the woman who threatens to sue him. The fable (about Aesop and a drunken bitch; 17F2) he comes up with subsequently only (and understandably) adds to her anger, for which *his* drunkenness[7] (as well as his unteachability) is to blame.

G2 Ar. *Av.* 471[8] (cf. Σ G65a)

In Aristophanes' *Birds* Pisthetaerus[9] blames the leader of the chorus for want of learning, because he has not read[10] Aesop and does not know the (aetiological) fable which he is about to tell (17F6).

"jokes"): a juxtaposition of G1c, in which γέλοιον is connected with λόγον (cf. Σ *in* Ar. G67b); contra: Neubner 1889, 31); Aristophanes' use of terminology (Adrados lc; cf. the next chapter, 1.2-3); Hsch. G69a, *App. Prov.* 1.11.

[4] Cf. Σ *ad loc.* (Ar. 17T23b): οἰόμενος περὶ μυθαρίων [see below, Chapter I.III, 1.3] αὐτὸν λέγειν. VΓLhAld

[5] Archibald (1912, 65) matches Ar. G1a-c. Cf. Jedrkiewicz 1989, 348; Cascajero 1991, 31.

[6] Cf. Σ *ad loc.*: μιμεῖται τὰ εἰρημένα ὑπὸ τοῦ υἱοῦ. VLhAld

[7] Rutherford 1883, p. XXIX; Vaio 1971, 341-342.

[8] Also quoted by *Suda* α 1470 and π 783 Adler.

[9] For the disputed orthography of the name, see below, Ar. 17F6, n. 76.

[10] Not because he has lost his quondam supremacy (contra Alink 1983, 67, 69). The interpretation of πεπάτηκας is disputed since antiquity. One scholium (e) equates πεπάτηκας with ἀνέγνως, another (d) with ἐνδιατρῖψαι and ἀφίκεσθαι, whereas Tricl. *ad loc.* copies both explanations. To the former, cf. Pl. *Phdr.* 237a; LSJ *s.* πατέω (II 2); Erasm. (17T63a): *qui non legisset*; Gellert 1744, p. 68 Scheibe; Nøjgaard 1964, 473-474; Perkell, C., "On the Two Voices of the Birds in *Birds*", *Ramus* 22, 1993, 6; Hasubek 1996, col. 189. Contra: Adrados 1979a, 392; Jedrkiewicz (1986, 150, n. 11 (following La Penna 1962, 283, n. 50); 1989, 64, n. 108). To the

G3 Pl. *Phd.* 60c-61b

Plato has Socrates, who has just told an aetiological fable cautiously ascribed to Aesop (Pl. 49F1), explain to Cebes in prison that he has been "versifying" (ἐντείνας)[11] those fables[12] which he had at hand (προχείρους) and knew, to obey a recurring dream urging him to make "music" (μουσική); he now realizes that "popular" (δημώδης) music might be meant, (fictitious) poetry, not philosophy as he had always thought before.[13]

G4 Mnesim. *Φαρμακοπώλης*, fr. 6 *PCG ap.* Σ *in* Ar. G66a

See the next chapter, 5.8.

G5 Arist. *Rh.* 2.20, 1393a23-1394a18[14]

This passage from the *Rhetoric* is the oldest extant theoretical discussion of fable. Dealing with persuasive instruments which are common to all three kinds of speeches, Aristotle distinguishes enthymemata and exempla. He subdivides exempla into historical and fictional ones, fictional exempla into comparisons (παραβολή[15]) and

---

latter, cf. *Suda* lc; *Mantiss. prov.* 2.54, explaining: ἐπὶ τῶν ἰδιωτῶν; likewise Rogers (1906, 59) and Casevitz 1978, 48. García Iglesias (1986-1987, 258, n. 61) does not take sides; cf. Dunbar 1995, 325-326. Differently Rutherford 1883, p. XXXIV, n. 2, comparing Diogenian. 2.95 (corrupted in Apostol. 4.2) and Eust. *Od.* λ 277. According to Vickers (M., "Alcibiades at Sparta: Aristophanes *Birds*", *CQ* 45, 1995, 344), following Brumoy (P., *Le théâtre des grecs*, 1780²), it "refers to the Spartans' preference for the cultivation of the body over the mind".

[11] Not "setting to music": Bal (1950, 6, n. 2), Bluck (1955, 40, n. 1), Hackforth (R., *Plato's Phaedo*, Cambridge: UP 1955, 33, n. 4), Loriaux (1969, 33) and Gallop (1975, 78) contra Burnet 1911, 15-16; cf. Archer-Hind 1894, 6-7; Rowe 1993, 120. Cf. Socr. 46T2 (Plu.) ὁ Σωκράτης...τοὺς δ' Αἰσώπου μύθους ἔπεσιν ἐνήρμοζεν ὡς ποίησιν οὐκ οὖσαν ᾗ ψεῦδος μὴ πρόσεστι; 46T3 (Aug.) *Socrates...Aesopi fabulas pauculis versibus persecutus est, verba et numeros suos adhibens rebus alterius...*; 46T6 (Psel.).

[12] Moors 1982, 44: "myths".

[13] On Socrates as a fabulist, see below, 46. Socr. Cf. Baker 1969, 583. Mader (1951, 12-13), Holbek (1977, col. 884) and Patterson (1991, 6-7) take προχείρους to point at a written source, Duchemin (1975/1976, 33) and Jedrkiewicz (1989, 369; cf. Archer-Hind 1894, 8-9) at oral tradition, Nøjgaard (1964, 474) at both.

[14] Cf. anon *ad loc.* (pp. 125-126 Rabe); Arist. Lat. *anon.*, *Guil.*

[15] Thus Freese 1926, 273; Arnhart 1981, 144; Wartelle, A., *Lexique de la 'Rhétorique' d'Aristote*, Paris: Les Belles Lettres 1982, sv; Kennedy 1991, 179; Fortenbaugh 1995, 3. Fuhrmann (M., "Über kleine Gattungen als Gegenstand der Anfangslekture", *AU* 18.5, 1975, 29) and Von Moos (P., *Geschichte als Topik. Das rhetorische Exemplum von der Antike zur Neuzeit...*, Hildesheim/Zurich/New York 1988, 52, 594) translate "Parabel", Alewell (1913, 15) "gleichniss[es]", Roberts (1946) "illustrative parallel", Cope-Sandys 1877 and Grimaldi 1988 *ad loc.* "juxtaposition"; cf. Zinato 1989, 244-245; McCall, M.H., Jr., *Ancient Rhetorical Theories of Simile and Comparison*, Cambridge,

fables[16], and fables into Aesopic and Libyan ones (see the next chapter, 4.1, 5.5).

Aristotle does not define the fable (nor the historical exemplum and the comparison), but gives two examples (39F1-2). Both fables are told *in extenso* in a similar political context: they constitute a speech delivered (by Stesichorus and Aesop) in a deliberative assembly, and have a clearly persuasive function (although Stesichorus' fable is a secondary aetiology; see below, 7F2). It cannot be deduced from these two exemplifications that Aristotle implicitly reduces fable to animal fable[17], since a human being plays quite a large part in one of them.

Aristotle deems fables to be fitting in deliberative speeches, which is also apparent from the two specimens of the genre. Because of their very fictitiousness fables have, when compared with historical examples, one advantage and one disadvantage: on the one hand, fables are easier to find[18] (like comparisons), provided that one is able to see the analogy[19] (τὸ ὅμοιον; anon. τὰς ὁμοιότητας; *simile* Arist. Lat.), which the study of philosophy[20] facilitates; on the other hand, historical examples are more useful in deliberation, since, in general, *l'histoire se répète.*

MA: Harvard UP 1969, 24-27. Heijbroek (1941, 13) incorrectly paraphrases Aristotle.

[16] Cope's restraint (1867, 254-255; cf. Fortenbaugh 1995, 5-6) to identify λόγοι with "fables" is unnecessary. Alewell's statement (1913, 15) that "veranlaßt ist Aristoteles...dadurch, daß im Aisoproman der held seine fabeln vielfach eben als παραδείγματα vortrug" is based upon the untenable *Volksbuch* theory, for which see, e.g., Perry 1965, pp. XCIIIsq, n. 1 contra Hausrath 1898.

[17] Contra Vandenberghe (1950, 12), Adrados (1979a, 37) and, already, La Fontaine (1668, 37; quoted above, Chapter I, n. 53); cf. Lloyd 1966, 406; Fortenbaugh 1995, 6.

[18] εὑρεῖν, for which see Schutrumpf, E., "Non-Logical Means of Persuasion", in: Fortenbaugh, W.W.-Mirhady, D.C. [eds.], *Peripatetic Rhetoric After Aristotle*, New Brunswick/London: Transaction Publishers 1994, 100-101.

[19] Labarrière's paraphrase (J.-L., "Le rôle de la *phantasía* dans la recherche du bien pratique", in: Aubenque, P.-Tordesillas, P. (eds.), *Aristote Politique*, Paris: PUF 1993, 251-252) of this sentence is inaccurate. For ὅμοιον, cf. Schickert, K., *Die Widerlegung beim frühen Aristoteles*, Munchen: Beck 1977, 31, on 1.2, 1357b28 and 2.25, 1402b16; Labarrière, J.-L., L'Orateur politique face à ses contraintes", in: Furley-Nehamas 1994, 242, adducing *Po.* 22, 1459a7-8 (τὸ γὰρ εὖ μεταφέρειν τὸ τὸ ὅμοιον θεωρεῖν ἐστιν; cf. Lucas, D.W., *Aristotle. Poetics*, Oxford: Clarendon P 1968, 212). Laks 1994, 287: "ceci semble impliquer qu'on ne sera pas seulement d'autant meilleur métaphorique, mais bien meilleur métaphoricien...qu'on sera meilleur philosophe."

[20] Cf. Kennedy 1991, 181 with n. 133; anon. *ad loc.*: τῇ διαλεκτικῇ; differently Cope 1867, 256: "literature" (likewise Jebb (see McMahon 1927, 2.1)); Pawate 1986, 30: "cultivation".

Finally, Aristotle gives precepts for the use of exempla: in the absence of enthymemata, exempla must be used as demonstrative proofs (ὡς ἀποδείξεσιν), but, when enthymemata are at hand, exempla must be used as evidence (ὡς μαρτυρίοις).[21] This implies that exempla should stand last; otherwise, the argumentation would resemble induction, which is, as a rule, out of place in rhetorics. Moreover, postposition makes one single example suffice.

G6 Chamael. fr. 45 Giordano² *ap.* Hsch. G69b

See the next chapter, 5.5.

G7 Auct. ad Her. 1.6.10

This anonymous rhetorical treatise lists the fable as the first of eighteen means which an orator can use in the *exordium* of his speech to make an audience which is tired with listening[22] laugh.

G8 Cic. *Inv.* 1.17.25 (cf. Mar. Victor. G47)

Cicero's *De inventione* informs the orator that it may be useful to begin a speech with something ridiculous, either extempore or kept in reserve for this end, e.g. a fable, unless the gravity of the case at hand precludes joking. Like the preceding testimony, Cicero notices that laughter can regain the fatigued listeners' attention.

G9 Cic. *De or.* 2.66.264

In his *On the making of an orator*, Cicero has Caesar include the telling of fables among the things which can provoke laughter (*rerum* [23]*faceta*).

G10 Demetr. *Eloc.* 157-158

Pseudo-Demetrius' *On Style* includes fable (μῦθος[24]), together with proverb (ib. 156) and comparison (ib. 160)[25], among the sources in

---

[21] Cf. [Arist.] *Pr.* 18.3, 916b26-36, where, however, it is uncertain whether λόγοι and μῦθοι really are "fables" (Grimaldi 1988, 257) rather than just "tales" (Hett, W.S., *Aristotle. Problems*, I, Loeb, 1953² (repr. 1961), 371); for the fundamentally different appreciation of examples and enthymemata, see Laks 1994, 302.

[22] To an orator, not to a teacher (contra Josifović 1974, 34).

[23] Not *verborum*, as Nøjgaard (1964, 107) states.

[24] Grube (1961, 46, n. 56) translates "legend", Kindstrand (J.F., "The Greek Concept of Proverbs", *Eranos* 76, 1978, 71-85 [repr. in: Carnes 1988, 233-253], 81) "myth".

[25] McCall 1969, 137-155.

subject-matter of the elegant style. If inserted at the right moment, a fable is charming, either an pre-existing fable or one which is made up to fit the situation at hand. Each type is exemplified by an allusion to an aetiological fable; one is about two men (Demetr. 43A1 = Arist. 57T1), the other about a Cat and the Moon (Demetr. 43A2 = auct. inc. 58T1).

G11 Liv. 2.32.9

When Menenius Agrippa is about to tell the famous[26] fable[27] of the Belly and the Members to end the *secessio plebis*, Livy characterizes the genre as "that ancient and rude way of speaking"[28].

G12 Phaedr. 1.*Prol.*

In the brief prologue to his first fable volume, Phaedrus states that it is intended both to provoke laughter and to give prudent counsels of how to live life. He points to the fictitious and comical[29] nature of his work, to defend himself against possible criticism[30] of the fact that trees[31], not only animals, are gifted with speech.

G13 Phaedr. 2.*Prol.*

In the prologue to his next volume, Phaedrus qualifies fables as exempla, whose one and only aim is to correct men's errors, "that one may sharpen his wits by a close application to them".[32]

---

[26] Quint. G18b *nota illa...fabula*; see the references given below, 44. Alcmaeon, n. 8.

[27] Ogilvie, R.M., *A Commentary on Livy. Books 1-5*, Oxford: Clarendon P 1965, 312: "parable".

[28] Or perhaps rather its narrator Menenius as a plebeian; see Ogilvie, *op. cit.* 313. Foster (B.O., *Livy*, I, Loeb, 1919 (repr. 1976), 323-325) renders: "in the quaint and uncouth style of that age".

[29] 7 *fictis iocari...fabulis*; cf. G12.37 *fictis...iocis*; 2.9.13 *fictas...fabulas*, 4.18.2 *finxit*; G11.5 *iocus*, 4.2.1 *Ioculare*, 4.7.2 *hoc iocorum...genus*, 4.2.2 *ludimus*, *App.* 2.1 *ludit.*

[30] 5 *calumniari*, another instance of the poet's markedly frequent legal vocabulary analyzed by Oberg (1996b, starting from C.F. Schmid's neglected *De iurisprudentia Phaedri*, Wittenberg 1788).

[31] Perry (1965, p. LXXXII) deduces that Phaedrus' first volume as we have it is incomplete, since speaking trees are absent. One of the *fabulae novae* (tentatively restored from the prose paraphrases) does, however, contain a talking oak (16 Zander (1921, 32-35) = 12 Marchesi (1923, 75, 102)). Phaedrus does not subdivide fable by using characters as a criterion (contra Nøjgaard 1964, 69).

[32] Translations from Phaedr. G12-13 are by Perry 1965, 233, 257.

G14 Phaedr. 3.*Prol.*
In his third prologue, Phaedrus, himself a freedman of Augustus[33], explains the genre's origin: fables, fictitious and comical (cf. G12), were invented in slavery, where one cannot speak outright, to be able to give vent to one's feelings while eluding criticism (33-37)[34].

Although Sejanus had taken offence at his fables and prosecuted the fabulist (40-48), Phaedrus declares that he does not intend "to brand individuals, but to display life itself and the ways" of mankind (49-50).

G15a Phaedr. 4.*Prol.*11-13
See the next chapter, 4.1.

G15b Phaedr. 4.2.1-7
In a programmatic promythium Phaedrus points to the useful message which can be found hidden under the comical outward appearance of his fables. This is subsequently illustrated by a fable (*Aes.* 511) about a weasel who rolled in the flour; this outlook deceived three naïve mice, but a mouse who knew all the tricks immediately perceived her true nature.

G16 Phaedr. 5.*Prol.*
See the next chapter, 4.1.

G17 Sen. *Polyb. Cons.* 8.3-4
Seneca dissuades Polybius from occupying himself with fables[35] as long as he has not come to terms with his brother's death, since the

[33] Dithmar's (1982, 12) and Liebchen's (1990, 108) assertions that Phaedrus calls himself "Augustus libertus" are probably based upon an incorrect interpretation of the genitives in the title *PHAEDRI AVGVSTI LIBERTI*...

[34] These verses were copied by Perotti in the prologue to his *Epitome* (Boldrini, S., "Il prologo dell'*Epitome* e la versificazione 'giambica' di Niccolò Perotti", *Res Publica Litterarum* 14, 1991, 9-10).

[35] Postgate (1919, 23-24), Prinz (1922/1923, 62, 70) and Perry (1965, p. LXXIX, n. 1) rightly point to the worthlessness of *intemptatum Romanis ingeniis opus* as a criterion for dating Phaedrus; cf. Gellert 1744, 74; Thiele 1911, 546-548; Currie 1984, 502. Differently (e.g.): Hanlet 1943, 322; Herrmann 1950, 126 (contra: De Lorenzi 1955, 9, comparing (referring to Paratore, E., *Storia della letteratura latina*, Firenze 1950, 538) Cicero's silence on Lucretius); Hambauer, A., review of Werner (J., *Phädrus. Äsopische Fabeln*, Leipzig: Reclam 1961), *Helikon* 7, 1967, 672-673; Önnerfors 1987, 431.

cheerful nature of fables requires a relaxed mind, which has come to itself.[36]

G18a Quint. *Inst.* 1.9.1-3

In his *Instruction of the Orator*, Quintilian advises the *grammaticus* to teach his pupils the rudiments of rhetorics by instructing them, among other things, to retell and write down in plain language, to prosify and paraphrase fables, now in abridged, now in embellished form.[37] He who executes this task sufficiently can cope with everything. Fables are excellent teaching materials because they follow closely upon the nurses' fairy tales.

G18b Quint. *Inst.* 5.11.19-21[38]

Like Aristotle (G5), Quintilian classes the fable among the exempla, technical proofs (besides *signa* and *argumenta*) which an orator can use in the *argumentatio* of his speech.[39] An *exemplum* is defined as the commemoration of something which really happened or is presented as having really happened, which is useful in persuading.

Again like Aristotle, Quintilian does not define (either Aesopic or Libyan) fable (see the next chapter, 4.1, 5.5), but gives two examples. Unlike Aristotle, however, he merely alludes to his exemplifications, and takes them from Latin literature. His first example, the fable of the Members and the Belly (Liv. G11), serves to illustrate his statement about the aptitude of fables to persuade the simple-minded and

[36] Mazzoli (1970, 152) deduces that Seneca "non mostra di averla [*sc* favolistica] in gran concetto"

[37] This passage is the object of several polemics Thiele (1911, 548, n 18) does not consider Quintilian's silence on Phaedrus (tentatively explained by Önnerfors 1987, 431, cf n 35 above) to be meaningful, whereas De Lorenzi (1955, 191 "Quintiliano si comporta esattamente come oggi i suoi colleghi professori, i quali volendo evitare che i loro studenti ricorrano alle traduzioni, ne nascondono perfino l'esistenza"), Caratello (1964, 136), and Currie (1984, 502) do Perry (1965, pp L-LI) identifies *uersus* with (pseudo-)Babrius (cf Marchesi 1923, 32, n 3), Postgate (1919, 23), Hausrath (1936, 103, n 2) and Daly (1961a, 16) with Phaedrus, Colson (1919, 61, *Marcus Fabius Quintilianus Institutionis Oratoriae liber I*, Cambridge UP 1924 (repr Hildesheim/New York 1973), 116-117) with neither, cf O'Neil (E N , in Hock-O'Neil 1986, 119, 146), printing a period before *uersus primo soluere* Viljamaa (T , "From Grammar to Rhetoric First Exercises in Composition According to Quintilian, Inst 1,9" *Arctos* 22, 1988, 187-189) does not consider paraphrasing to be a separate exercise, but Colson (F H , "Quintilian I 9 and the 'Chria' in Ancient Education", *CR* 35, 1921, 151) does

[38] Used as source by Erasm (Hes 2T44)

[39] Cf McCall 1969, 187-210

uneducated, who like listening to fiction and easily agree with what they like.[40] His second example is a Horatian beast fable (*Ep.* 1.1.73-75: Lion and Fox)[41], which serves to show that fables occur even in poetry. Quintilian mentions Hesiod as *primus auctor* of fable, which is accurate for extant ancient literature (see 2F1).[42]

Finally, Quintilian points to the close relationship of fable and a certain type of allegorical proverb which is like an abridged fable, which he exemplifies with a so-called "Wellerism" (named after Sam Weller from Dickens' *Pickwick Papers*)[43].

G18c Quint. *Inst.* 6.3.44

Quintilian remarks that fable telling is a graceful and usually successful means to provoke laughter.[44]

G19a Babr.[45] *Prooem.* 1[46]

In the prologue to Babrius' first volume, fables are said to reflect the Golden Age, when human beings, animals, trees (and stones[47] in the Athoan manuscript) could speak with each other, and men and gods were friends.[48] Babrius self-confidently dedicates his fables to one

---

[40] "He would certainly have said the same about the Parables of Jesus", De Ste. Croix remarks (G.E.M., *The Class Struggle in the Ancient Greek World. From the Archaic Age to the Arab Conquests*, London 1981, 444). Erasmus (*Mor. enc.* 26) calls this very fable *ridiculus ac puerilis apologus*.

[41] Discussed by Warmuth 1992, 46-52. Further references are given below, Pl. 49A1, nn. 111, 114.

[42] The plural in Erasm. lc (*Quintilianus ab Hesiodo scriptas fuisse* [sc. *existimat*]) seems less accurate; the accuracy of Lorichius' calculation (1542, 5: "*Qui* [sc. *Hesiodus*] *annis centum atque tribus superior Æsopo fuit*") is deceptive.

[43] Cic. *Att.* 5.15.3, Amm. Marc. 16.5.10, Erasm. *Adag.* 2.9.84 (682A-683B); Otto 1890, 57; Archibald 1910, p. XV; Kruyskamp, C., *Apologische Spreekwoorden*, 's-Gravenhage: Nijhoff 1947, 1; Perry 1959, 19, n. 9 (referring to Taylor, A., *The Proverb*, Cambridge, MA 1931, 200-220); id. 1965, p. XXXI (see above, Chapter I.I, 1.2); Van Dijk 1996a, 516; cf. *iamb. adesp.* 12 Diehl, for which see the Appendix below.

[44] De la Ville de Mirmont (1911, 279) compares Cic. G8.

[45] Hoch (1870, 10-16) abrogates the first proem; Burges (1845, 1847) ascribed both proems to Socrates (but see the General Introduction above, n. 5; below, 46. Socr.). For corruptions of the name of Babrius, see Luzzatto-La Penna 1986, p. VI; cf. Van Dijk 1996b, 161.

[46] Verses 1-7, 9-12 are preserved also in *PBour.* 1, "a student's reading notebook" (Fisher 1987, 13-14).

[47] πεύκη *PBour.*, πέτρα *A* (*si vera lectio*; see Jouguet, P.-Perdrizet, P., "Le papyrus Bouriant Nr. 1, cahier d'écolier grec d'Egypte", in: Cronert 1906, 161.

[48] Holzberg (1993, 57), looking for Babrian echoes of Callimachus' choliambic fables (20F1-2), suggests that Babrius here hints at Callimachus' description of this original condition in his "4. Iambus". First, this should read "2. Iambus" (20F1);

Branchus[49], "having softened[50] the hard chords of the stinging iambic."[51]

G19b Babr. *Prooem.* 2

In the prologue to his second volume[52], which is dedicated to King Alexander's son[53], Babrius calls fable "the invention of the Syrians of old", by which he probably means the Assyrians[54]. "Wise Aesop" is mentioned as the first Greek fabulist. Babrius runs his imitators down, and again stresses his softening the stinging iambs.

G19c Babr. 119.11-12

This (Pseudo-?)Babrian[55] epimythium (as well as the very fable about Hermes (*Aes.* 285)[56]) bears witness to the presence of gods as characters in fables.[57] In addition, the moral function of fables is mentioned in the epimythium.

G20a Theon, *Prog.* 1

In the preface to his *Progymnasmata*, Aelius Theon proudly claims that

---

secondly, similarities between Babrius' first prologue and Callimachus' fourth Iamb (20F2) do occur: δάφνη, φύλλα and Βράγχος. Babrius does not subdivide fable (contra Nøjgaard 1964, 69; cf. above, Phaedr. G12, n. 31). Williams (1981) argues that vv. 5-7 allude to Pl. *Plt.* 272bc (for which see the Appendix below).

[49] See Perry 1965, pp. LVI-LVII.

[50] Luzzatto (1975, 66) takes this to refer to the metre, Perry (1965, 4-5, n. a) to the mild tone of Babrius' fables. On the text of these verses, see Knoll 1881, 188-195; Vaio 1987, 867-871.

[51] Translations from Babr. G19ab are by Perry 1965, 5, 139.

[52] Edition according to Werner 1892, 5.

[53] The alphabetical position of this prologue, whose first word is Μῦθος, after Babr. 107 is taken by Perry (1965, pp. LVII-LIX) to be secondary, by Holzberg (1993, 59-60) to be original. Avian. G59 mentions two volumes by Babrius, *Suda* sv Βαβρίας, however, ten (Fusci 1901, 33; Christoffersson 1901, 7-8 contra *Sudam*). The identification of Alexander is disputed (Luzzatto-La Penna 1986, pp. X-XI contra (*inter alios*) Perry 1965, pp. XLVII-L (followed by Beavis 1990, 478)). Fusci (ib. 34-35, n. 2; cf. Holzberg ib., 66-67) and Christoffersson (ib. 16) argue that the two addressees are identical, which is doubted by Perry (ib., pp. LVI-LVII).

[54] Thus, e.g., Denis 1883, 288; Chambry 1960, p. XXVII; Holbek 1962, 43; Burkert 1984, 111. Contra: Landsberger 1859, pp. CVIIsq ("die Hebraer"); Von Bissing 1949, 227.

[55] Hohmann 1907, 83: "Hos versus qui nullis praeoccupatus opinationibus lectitaverit, Babrii esse necesse erit concedat."; cf. Nøjgaard 1967, 434. Perry (1965, 156), though, brackets the epimythium.

[56] Other versions: Xenocr. *AP* 16.187, *fab. aes.* 284 Hausrath, *Pa.Bodl.* 61 Chambry, *Dod.* ibid., Branc. 12; Adrados 1987a, 264.

[57] Cf. Scaliger 1561, 139: "*Etiam dii* [sc. *ab Æsopo adducuntur*]".

he has tried to give a definition of each exercise, in order to have an answer ready when asked what each is, which he exemplifies by his fable definition, the oldest extant one indeed[58] (if not antedated by Luc. Tarrh. G21): "A fable is a fictitious story which gives the semblance of reality[59]".

G20b Theon, *Prog.* 2

Theon recommends that the schoolmaster let his pupils learn by heart examples of each *progymnasma* which are worthy of imitation. He exemplifies fable by four[60] allusions to fables from classical authors, viz. Herodotus (31F1), Philistus (33F1), Theopompus (35F1), and Xenophon (50F1). Besides animals, human beings and personifications (War and Insolence) occur as characters in these exemplifications.

G20c Theon, *Prog.* 3

This is the longest (pp. 72-78 Spengel) ancient passage on fable which has come down to us. Theon begins by repeating his definition of the genre quoted above (G20a), to which he adds the restriction that he is only dealing with those μῦθοι which are followed, or some-

---

[58] Theon's definition is identical with Olympiodorus' (*in Grg.* 46.3), and remarkably similar (cf. Frutiger 1930, 181, n. 2) to Plutarch's, definition of myth (*Mor.* 348a): ὁ δὲ μῦθος εἶναι βούλεται λόγος ψευδὴς ἐοικὼς ἀληθινῷ (see Vernière, Y., *Symboles et mythes dans la pensée de Plutarque*, Paris: Les Belles Lettres 1977, 311). This is not to say that *Theon* defines myth (contra Smith 1974, 134; Romano 1964, 34). For the possibility of an early dating of Theon, see Butts 1987, 5-6.

[59] For this translation of ἀλήθειαν (contra Perry, whose interpretation (see above, Chapter I.I, 1.2) is followed by Holbek 1962, 39; Butts 1986, 257; Grimaldi 1988, 252; Easterling 1989a, 140, Reche Martínez 1991, 73; Holzberg 1993, 22 (cf. Brummack 1987, 253, n. 9; Demandt 1991, 399); Todenhagen, Chr., "An Urban Legend as a Modern-Day Fable", *Bestia* 6, 1994, 88; cf. Pomey 1665, 9: *veritas...aliqua*), see Van Dijk 1993d, 175-176; cf. Scaliger 1561, 138, paraphrasing τὴν ἀλήθειαν εἰκονίζει by "*verisimilis*"; Nøjgaard 1964, 55; García Gual 1978a, 11; Schenkeveld, D.M., "The Structure of Plutarch's *De audiendis poetis*", *Mnemosyne* 35, 1982, 67, n. 15 on *Mor.* 16B; Pignani 1983, 19: "una situazione reale". *Suda* μ 1389 Adler copies Theon's definition, not "alla lettera" (Lomanto 1982, 305) but adding τὴν to ἀλήθειαν. The definition by Pomey (1665, 8: *sermo falsus, veritatem effingens*) is a translation of Theon's (ignored by Lindner 1978a, 219; Hasubek 1983b, 9); cf. Scaliger lc: *oratio falsa repræsentãs veritatem*. Clark (1952, 261) enumerates Latin translations of Theon by Camerarius (1541), Heinsius (1626) and Scheffer (1670). I fail to understand García Gual's assertion (1978b, 191) that "la ironía está ya expresada en la definición" (as he is unlikely to have had in mind his curious substitution of ἐστι by ἤ (cf. 1995, 15)).

[60] At least six in Reche Martínez's incorrect translation of the corrupt passage (1991, 62): "...y las que ambos tienen en los dos primeros libros"; cf. below, Hdt. 31F1, n. 8.

times preceded, by the λόγος (statement) metaphorically pictured in the story, by which Theon means the epimythium or promythium[61].

Discussing fable terminology, Theon recognizes that animals and human beings can occur as characters in fables, and that the subject-matter of fables can be possible and impossible; he mentions Homer, Hesiod and Archilochus "and some others" as pre-Aesopic fable writers (see below, 1., 2F1, 4F1-3); he states that a fable contains some exhortation, and that the only thing a fable is after is to give useful advice.

Theon then (p. 74) describes the exercise proper: fables should be (1) retold, (2) declined, (3) connected with a context, (4) elaborated and (5) abridged, (6) provided with an epimythium and (7) made up in accordance with a given promythium, (8) disproven and (9) proven. The rest of Theon's chapter consists of a systematical explanation[62] and exemplification of these exercises.[63]

(1) Fables must be told in a style which is simple, natural, and as artless and clear as possible.[64] This can be achieved by first memorizing ancient fables written in this style. It is charming to begin a given fable with *oratio recta* (ἐκ τῶν μύθων ἄρξασθαι)[65] of one of the characters. Theon illustrates this procedure by two lines from Hesiod's fable of the Hawk and Nightingale (2F1).

(2) The pupils must decline fables in *numeri* and *casus obliqui*[66], especially in the accusative case, which the ancients preferred: by thus relegating a fable to the dim and distant past, instead of presenting it as their own view, they had a good excuse for telling things which seemed impossible. Within a fable the grammatical cases in which a character occurs have to alternate for the sake of variation. This is exemplified by two quotations from Phaedo's fable of the Cub and the Prince (51F1ab).

---

[61] Cf. Reichel, G., *Quaestiones progymnasmaticae*, Diss. Leipzig: Noske 1909, 49; Butts 1987, 279.

[62] Theon's standard procedure (Hock-O'Neil 1986, 65).

[63] Hausrath (1898) considered the *Collectio Augustana* to be the product of such exercises; contra (rightly): Perry 1936, 156sqq; Adrados 1979a, 76; Holzberg 1993, 105.

[64] Likewise, e.g., Richer, H., *Fables*, Paris: Barrois 1748, p. XIX (Pascal 1992, 186).

[65] To be rendered by "to start with direct speech" (Van Dijk 1995a, 236), rather than by "beginning...from the fables" (Butts 1987, 263).

[66] Cf. the inflexion of chreiai, for which see Hock-O'Neil 1986, 69.

(3) The context (διήγημα—"narrative") can follow or precede the fable. Theon exemplifies this exercise by the fable about the Camel Wanting Horns (*Aes.* 117)[67], which is linked by a typical formula (παραπλήσιον...)[68] with a story about Croesus.

(4) Fables can be elaborated by lenghtening the speeches of the characters (προσωποποιΐαι) or adding geographical descriptions. (5) Abridging goes the other way round.

(6) An epimythium is a gnomical statement which follows, and is in keeping with, the fable. Theon gives the fable of the Dog Carrying a Piece of Meat (*Aes.* 133)[69] by way of example. One fable can produce several epimythia, because every single element of the fable may serve as a starting point.

(7) Likewise, many fables can fit to one promythium. Pupils will be able to do this easily, when equipped with a thorough knowledge of fables, either read in the ancient writers, or only heard, or made up by themselves.

(8) Since the fabulist himself admits that what he writes is fictitious and impossible but trustworthy and useful, one has to refute a fable by showing that what he tells is untrustworthy and useless. (9) Confirming a fable is the other way round. There are eleven possible "commonplace arguments" (τόποι): (a) "obscurity", (b) "implausibility", (c) "inappropriateness", (d) "incompleteness", (e) "excess", (f) "nontradition", (g) "inconsistency", (h) "order", (i) "disadvantageousness", (j) "dissimilarity", (k) "falsity".[70] These points are again worked out one by one.

(a) The exact meaning or grammatical function of one or several words may be unclear. (b) A particular act or speech may be possible in itself, but one can question (b1) the character by whom, (b2) the place where, (b3) the time when, (b4) the way how, (b5) the reason

[67] Other versions: Luc. *Icar.* 10 *c.* Σ *ad loc.*, Lib. *Decl.* 31.43, Aphth. 15, *fab. aes.* 119 Hausrath, Avian. 8; *Pa.Bodl.* 147 Chambry, *Dod.* ibid., *Tetr.* 1.13, Synt. 59, *Syr. XLIII*, 73 Lefèvre, Doxap. *Comm. in* Aphth. (II 137 Walz), Niceph. Greg. *Hist. Byz.* 28.16, ib. 37.9, Apostol. 8.43 (Arsen. 28.56), Arsen. 32.34 (Apostol. 9.59b); See Dahnhardt 1912, 265-266; Adrados 1987a, 128-129 (both incomplete), 444 (medieval versions).

[68] παραπλήσιόν μοι δοκεῖ τι παθεῖν...καὶ Κροῖσος ὁ Λυδός. Cf., e.g., D.S. 38F1 τὸ παραπλήσιον οὖν ποιεῖν καὶ τὸν 'Αντίγονον, 38F2 τὸ παραπλήσιον δὲ καὶ τοῖς τὴν Τύκκην οἰκοῦσιν ἔσεσθαι.

[69] Further references are given below, Democr. 47A1, nn. 44-45.

[70] Translations by Butts 1987, 271. Cf. the *topoi* serving as starting points for the refutation of chreiai (see Hock-O'Neil 1986, 73).

why this happened or was said.[71] To (c), (d) and (e) (nearly) the same applies as to (b). (f) Fables may oppose common beliefs or notions. Theon's exemplifications show that gods can occur as characters in fables, and that the animals' nature is fixed. The coherence (g) or structure (h) of a fable may be defective. (i) is self-explanatory and can be used better in the refutation of the epimythium. (j) Fable and epimythium may not match. (k) The epimythium may not be "universally applicable".

G21 Luc. Tarrh. fr. 1 Linnenkugel *ap.* Ps.-Ammon. *Diff.* 18 (pp. 5-6 Nickau)[72]

Pseudo-Ammonius quotes the following definition, which elsewhere (Archil. 4T43 (Apostol.)) is explicitly attributed to Luci(ll)us Tarrhaeus: "A fable is a story in fictitious form with non-rational animals and plants which is told to men". Apostolius, in his turn, has a variant, which is again elsewhere (Archil. 4T35 (Eust.); cf. Hes. 2T30c: κατὰ τὸν παλαιόν[73]) ascribed to the same paroemiographer: "A fable is a fictitious story with non-rational animals or plants which is told to exhort men (*v.l.*: others[74])." All three Byzantine authors exemplify beast fable and plant fable by quotations of the *incipits* of Hesiod's and (one or two of) Archilochus', and Callimachus' fables, respectively (2F1, 4F1(-2)[75], 20F2); in addition, fable is defined as "an unfolded proverb".[76] Both this definition and the (three or four) exemplifications in all probability (cf. below, Herenn. Ph. G27) go back to Luci(ll)us, too.

G22 D.Chr. 55.10

In his discourse *On Homer and Socrates*, Dio, discussing the moral function of their comparisons, compares these with fables. The genre of

[71] Cf. Pomey 1665, 15: "*v.g. si mures induceres audaces, cervos lentos, columbas crudeles, benignos accipitres, & vulpes stolidas, peccares contra decorum tuaque fabula* probabilitate *careret.*"

[72] The lexicon Περὶ ὁμοίων καὶ διαφόρων λέξεων, attributed to Ammonius in Byzantine times, probably goes back to Herennius Philo's (cf. below, G27); see Gartner, H., "Ammonios" (4), *DKP* 1, col. 305; Nickau, K., *in ed.*, pp. LXVIsq, referring to Valckenaer; Hunger 1978, II 49.

[73] Linnenkugel *ad* Luc. Tarrh. fr. 1.

[74] Thus Σ *in* Theon (I 259 Walz) (not mentioning Luci(ll)us).

[75] Eust. quotes only from 4F1, Apostol. and Ps.-Ammon. from both 4F1 and 4F2.

[76] Linnenkugel (*ad* Luc. Tarrh. fr. 1) connects this definition with the elaboration of fables in the *progymnasmata* (cf. above, Theon, G20c). Both definitions are copied also by *Et. Gud. s.v.* αἶνος (pp. 48.15-27, 49.1-5 De Stefani).

fable is not mentioned as such, but exemplified by an allusion to Archilochus' (second) fox fable (4F2).

G23 D.Chr. 72.13

In his discourse *On personal appearance*, Dio praises Aesop, who proposes to caution men and display their mistakes by comical fables such as they prefer to hear, like children love their nurses telling fairy-tales (follows the fable of the Owl and the Birds; *Aes.* 437a)[77].

G24a Plu. *Mor.* 14E

In his *How the young man should study poetry*, Plutarch mentions Aesop's fables as one of the things[78] which children like to listen to because they appear not to be serious. He concludes that one has to mix *utile dulci* (τῷ τέρποντι τὸ χρήσιμον) in selecting appropriate oral and written literature for them.

G24b Plu. *Mor.* 16BC

In the same essay, Plutarch reminds his readers of Socrates putting Aesop's fables into verse (see above, Pl. G3), to illustrate his statement that poetry and fiction are inseparable[79].

G25a Plu. *Mor.* 152D

In Plutarch's *Banquet of the Seven Sages*, Solon admits that Aesop (in his fables) has the skill to give ear to ravens and jackdaws.

G25b Plu. *Mor.* 158B

Hesiod's fable of the Hawk and the Nightingale (2F1) is (rightly) called the first specimen of the genre, which (the genre) is highly praised.

---

[77] A variant version of id. 12.7-8 (*Aes.* 437); *PRyl.* 493.103-131. For a comparison of *Aes.* 437(a), 39 (*fab. aes.* 39ab Hausrath; *PMich.* 457; *PYale inv.* 1158; Rom. 24 Thiele; *Pa.Bodl.* 350 Chambry), 277 (Babr. 12; *Pa.Bodl.* 9 Chambry; *Dod.* ibid.) and 576 (Rom. 77 Thiele), see Thiele 1910, pp. LXIsq; Adrados 1979b, 1982a; 1987a, 62-64 (where Pol. *Lam.* (pp. 226, 228 Del Lungo) might be added).

[78] Plutarch refers also to Heraclid. Pont. *Abaris* (fr. 33 Wehrli) and Aristo, *Lyco* (frr. 73-75 Wehrli); see Reutern, G. von, *Plutarchs Stellung zur Dichtkunst. Interpretation der Schrift 'De audiendis poetis'*, Diss. Kiel 1933, 2-3; Valgiglio, E., *Plutarco. De audiendis poetis*, Torino: Loescher 1973, p. XV, 63-64; Van der Stockt, L., *Twinkling and Twilight. Plutarch's Reflections on Literature*, KAWLSK, 1992, 127.

[79] Not "synonym" (contra Von Reutern, *op. cit.* 13; rather Valgimigli, M., *La critica letteraria di Dione Crisostomo*, Bologna: Beltrami *s.a.*, 51: "la poesía è in ciò che il poeta canta, non nel modo onde lo canta".

G25c Plu. *Mor.* 162BC

Aesop reproaches his fellow-guests[80] that their making fun of his talking jackdaws and ravens (see above, G25a) is inconsistent with their listening to the talking dolphins in Gorgos' story about Arion. Diocles answers by pointing to the age-old tradition of that story.[81]

G25d Plu. *Mor.* 164B

Pittacus reminds Chersias that he is wont to praise Aesop, whose fables seem to contain all the Seven Sages' maxims. Aesop modestly remarks that Chersias indeed says so in jest, but that he ascribes these maxims to Homer[82] when serious.

G26 Plu. *Mor.* 871D

In his *On Herodotus' Malignity*, Plutarch compares the way in which Aesop has ravens and apes speak for himself (in his fables) to the way in which Herodotus uses Scythians, Persians, and Aegyptians.[83]

G27 Herennius Ph. fr. 32 Palmieri

After having reported Luci(ll)us Tarrhaeus' definitions and exemplifications of fable (G21), Eustathius adds that the same can also be found in Herennius Philo's work (presumably in his *Περὶ διαφόρων σημαινομένων*). However, Eustathius' words do not make clear to what extent their views are identical.

G28 (Ps.-)Diogenian. *Praef.*

This treatise *On proverbs* discusses fable and proverb as two related genres. The author's definition is nearly the same as Luci(ll)us Tarrhaeus' (who is not mentioned; G21)[84]: "A fable is <a story> in a fictitious form with non-rational animals and plants which is told to

---

[80] On the "attitude particulière d'Ésope, qui d'une part est semblable aux Sept Sages et qui d'autre part se montre leur adversaire", see Defradas, J., *Plutarque. Le Banquet des Sept Sages*, Paris: Klincksieck 1954, 24; cf. Jedrkiewicz 1989, 135-143; differently Luzzatto (1988, 442), arguing that "Esopo non ha un ruolo né minore né subordinato a quello degli altri *sophoi*".

[81] Defradas (*op. cit.* 110) cautions that the text is corrupt and lacunal.

[82] I fail to see why it is "curioso...que Esopo, al que antes [G25b] se ha presentado como discípulo de Hesíodo, aparezca como experto en citas homéricas" (García Gual 1994, 613).

[83] Nagy (1988, 237-241) carries Plutarch's comparison too far (see the Appendix below, under Herodotus).

[84] Cf. Cohn, L., "Diogenianos (4)", *RE* 5.1, Stuttgart: Metzler 1903, col. 783; Heimgartner 1940, 24sq.

exhort men." The author's exemplifications of beast- and plant fable are again identical with Luci(ll)us', although Hesiod is omitted here. The story in the *Odyssey* (14.457 ff.; see below, 1. Hom.) by means of which Odysseus seeks to get a cloak is clearly separated from the genre of fable.

In the subsequent terminological exposition (discussed in the next chapter), the author refers, by way of example, to fables by Simonides (9F1), Timocreon (10F1-2), Aristophanes (17F3), and Aeschylus (12F1). Two of these examples are inconsistent with his previous restriction of fable characters to animals and plants, since human characters occur in these exemplifications; one[85] of them (Ar. 17F3) even contains only human characters.

G29 Theo Sm. (p. 73 Hiller)

See the next chapter, 1.2, 5.5.

G30 Suet. *Rhet.* 1 (25.4)

In the preface of his *On rhetoricians*, Suetonius lists retelling fables[86] in different ways among the exercises which pupils are wont to make.

G31 Gell. 2.29.1

In his *Attic Nights*, Gellius highly praises Aesop's fictitious fables as a well-balanced combination of benefit and pleasure: their useful admonitory and persuasive message is conveyed in an attractive and elegant way, which he prefers to the philosophers' severe and imperious lessons.[87] These remarks introduce a lengthy fable with animal and human characters (from Ennius[88]; the Lark and the Farmer, *Aes.* 325).

---

[85] Not: all (contra Heimgartner 1940, 30); see below, A. 12F1.

[86] If one wishes not to adopt (with Kaster) Haupt's emendation of the text, Robinson's (R.P., *C. Suetoni Tranquilli de grammaticis et rhetoribus*, Paris: Champion 1925, 39) punctuation (placing a comma after the disputed *casus*) is preferable to Rolfe's (J.C., *Suetonius*, II, Loeb, 1914 (repr. 1970), 438).

[87] Gellius' praise was to be included in humanist fable collections (Enenkel 1993, 43). Cf. Erasm. *Cop.* 2 (p. 255 Knott), Lorichium 1542, 17-18; Gellert 1744, 18: *quod subtilissime edisserens Plato ipsi non persuadere potuit, Aesopus facili negotio obtinebit*; Schupp, B., *Ineptus orator*, Marburg 1642[3], 26 (Staege 1929, 17): "*Plus sapientiae est in fabulis Aesopi quam in omnibus omnium Occamistarum et Thomistarum disputationibus*".

[88] *Sat. inc.* II 21-58, pp. 207-209 Vahlen (cf. Gellert 1744, 74); 'reconstructions' such as Ribbeck's (O., "Bemerkungen zu Ennius", *RhM n.s.* 10, 1856, 289-292) are characterized by Holford-Strevens (L., *Aulus Gellius*, London: Duckworth 1988, 157) as "*versus (pessime) quadrati*"; cf. Magno, P., *Quinto Ennio*, Fasano: Schena 1979, 198, n.

G32 Luc. *VH* 2.18

In Lucian's *True History*, Aesop figures as a jester (γελωτοποιός) on the Island of the Blessed[89], from which we may infer that fables can have a comical function.

G33 Max. Tyr. 19.2

Maximus of Tyre, connecting the fable of the Lamb Preferring the Shepherd to the Butcher (*Aes.* 465) with its context, calls it a genre convention (ἐξουσία) that animals speak the same language as men.

G34 Max. Tyr. 32.1

Maximus opens this philosophical treatise by mentioning beasts, trees, fish, and human beings as possible fable characters, which can all speak to each other. He says that fables convey a brief meaning hinting at some aspect of reality (which reminds us of Theon's definition (G20a and c)). This serves as an introduction to a fable[90] which he suggests Epicurus (54T1) could have used, in which animals do speak to a human being, and which contains a remark in parentheses about the fixed (wily) nature of the fox in fables.

G35 Max. Tyr. 36

Maximus remarks that in fables, a genre which contains wisdom, animals and even trees can speak. This remark introduces a lenghty μῦθος with gods and human beings as characters, which I would rather call a myth[91].

G36 Σ *in Il.* 19.407[92]

This scholium *exegeticum* on the *Iliad* comments upon the faculty of

379; but cf. Courtney 1993, 15. Other versions: Babr. 88, Avian. 21 (see Muller 1976; Menna 1983; Adrados 1987a, 347, 426 (medieval versions; incomplete)); Franco de Amelia 3 (Finch 1978, 63); Erasm. *Cop.* 2 *bis* (pp. 255-256 Knott).

[89] García Gual (1994, 611, n. 18) ingeniously associates Lucian's subsequent mention of Diogenes with Adrados' analyses of Cynic themes in Aesop's life and fables (1978a; 1987b; cf. 1994, 55-77). There is, however, no connection between the fabulist and the Cynic in Lucian.

[90] Szarmach's comment (M., *Maximos von Tyros. Eine literarische Monographie*, Torun: Uniwersytet Mikolaja Kopernika 1985, 43: "im Corpus fabularum Aesopicarum gibt es dieses Marchen nicht") is inaccurate in two respects; see below, Epicur. 54T1 (Max. Tyr.).

[91] Szarmach (*op. cit.* 39) again a "Marchen".

[92] For the difficulty of determining the exact date of the *scholia exegetica*, see Erbse, I, pp. XII-XIII.

speech granted by Homer to Achilles' horses, and alludes in this connection to Hesiod's and Archilochus' fables (2F1, 4F1) and to Aesop.

G37 (Ps.-?)Ptol. Ascal. s.v. αἶνος καὶ παροιμία
Without mentioning Luci(ll)us Tarrhaeus (G21), Ptolemaeus repeats both of his definitions, while elaborating the second one: "A fable is an unfolded proverb with a story, (the proverb) completing the meaning." Conversely, he describes a proverb as "lacking the fable".

G38 Tat. *Orat.* 34
Defending Christians from pagan criticism by a vehement counter-attack on Greek culture, this apologist expresses his indignation about Aesop[93], who, in spite of his made-up fables, has reached everlasting fame and was even honoured with a statue by Aristodemus[94].

G39 anon. *Περὶ αἴνου* (*PSI* 11, 1935, 1221)
This papyrus-fragment was possibly part of a treatise on fable and proverb comparable with (Pseudo-)Diogenianus' *Preface* (G28; q.v.)[95], as both texts give one (the same) fable by Timocreon (10F1) and one[96] (another) Sybaritic fable by Aristophanes (17F4) as exemplifications.

G40a *Vit. Aesop.* 1 GW
In the proem of the Greek *Life of Aesop*, the fabulist is introduced as "extremely useful for life", which can, by implication, be taken to apply to his fables, too.

G40b *Vit. Aesop.* 7GW
This lyrical passage, Aesop's *Musenweihe*[97], describes how Isis and the

[93] If any attempt to date the legendary fabulist should really be made, one may follow Eus. *Chron.* 2.94 Schoene (and/or Hier. *Chron.* 1450 (p. 102 Helm), *IG* 14.1297 (*Chron. Rom.*, *FGrHist*252B5), *Suda* Αι 334 Adler), placing his death in the 54th Olympiad, and/or D.L. 1.3 (72), placing his *floruit* in the 52th, rather than Whittaker (*ad loc.*), who places his lifetime in the "7th. cent."; see *Aes.* T8-12 ("*De aetate*"); Sarkady 1968, 10.

[94] Koep (1969, col. 141) underlines the dependability of this mention; see also Jedrkiewicz 1989, 70.

[95] See Bartoletti *ad loc.*

[96] From καὶ] | μετ' ὀλίγον one might deduce that the preceding lacuna originally contained a quotation of, or from, Ar. 17F3, too.

[97] See Mignogna 1992, 76-84.

Muses (G; W has only Tyche) reward Aesop with the faculty of speech and the invention of fables for his piety. Isis prays that he will become famous (only in G).

G40c *Vit. Aesop.* 100GW

At the end of his stay at Croesus' court (which is a structurally conspicuous point of the story)[98], Aesop is reported to have written down his fables, which are said to be "still known" (G; W reads "read").[99]

G41 Hermog. *Prog.* 1

Since Hermogenes, the fable has become the first exercise in the *progymnasmata* (Theon (G20b) had relegated it to the second place, after the χρεία).[100] Hermogenes explains that it is useful to put the young pupils in touch with fables first, because fables can mould their character while it is still possible.[101]

Hermogenes alludes to the two oldest extant Greek animal fables (Hes. 2F1; Archil. 4F2 (?)[102]), and reports that Aesop used fables at symposiums.

Hermogenes does not give a definition but merely a profile of the genre: a fable must be fictitious, useful for life, and true to nature, which can be achieved by selecting characters which fit with the topic. Hermogenes' examples show a stock characterization of the animals.

Elaborating and abridging fables is the only exercise mentioned. Fables can be elaborated[103] by inventing speeches (λόγους), which is exemplified[104] by two versions of one fable (The Apes Founding a City; *Aes.* 464)[105]. At first sight, this seems again—as Hermogenes'

---

[98] Chapter 101 marks the beginning of the so-called Babylonian part of the *Life*.

[99] Holzberg's suggestion (1993, 82) that this is a reference to the fable collection following the *Life* in the MSS calls for further study; cf. the present writer's forthcoming review.

[100] See Hock-O'Neil 1986, 65-66, 159 (Mack, B.L.-O'Neil); Butts 1987, 20.

[101] Adduced by Nøjgaard (1964, 481) against Perry's assertion (1959, 33, n. 56) that the *progymnasmata* were meant for *advanced* students. The importance generally placed on "explicit, moral training" resulted partly from the assumption that "children's characters are extremely malleable" (Fisher 1987, 19).

[102] See below, Archil. 4F2, n. 59.

[103] Niceph. Basil. *Prog.* 1.2 (pp. 73-74 Pignani) applies Hermogenes' method.

[104] Contra Hunger 1978, I 94-95.

[105] Other versions: Prisc. G70 (quoted by Lorichius 1542, 13); *Syr. XXXVIII* Lefèvre; Doxap. *Comm. in* Aphth. (II 176 Walz); Niceph. Chrys. *Or.* 1 (p. 5 Treu), Greg. Cypr. *Cod. Mon. Gr.* 201 (see Κουκουλές 1953; Παπαδημητρίου 1987, 107-108); Adrados 1987a, 392-393 (incomplete).

other exemplifications—a pure animal fable.[106] However, human beings do play an, if indirect, part in the longer version, in that a simian orator explicitly refers to mankind (οἱ ἄνθρωποι) as a model of their utopian dream.

Hermogenes prescribes that long sentences must be avoided and the style must be sweet (γλυκύτης).[107] Promythia and epimythia, the statements (λόγος) which show the use of the fable, must alternate. Finally, Hermogenes notices that the rhetoricians used fables as[108] examples.

G42 Philostr. (II)[109] *VA* 5.14-16

In this passage[110] from *The life of Apollonius of Tyana*, Philostratus has Menippus and Apollonius compare the genres of myth and fable. Menippus prefers the former, Apollonius the latter. Curiously enough, both use the same arguments: myths, unlike fables, are presented as true; fables are children's literature, and are about animals. Menippus condescendingly[111] qualifies beast fables as old wives' and children's stuff. Apollonius, however, juxtaposes the originality and the effect of both genres on their audience. First, myths are common, but Aesop followed a new avenue. Secondly, myths corrupt because they serve as a model for all kinds of vices, whereas fables are beneficial because their obvious fictitiousness has a didactic function which is stated after the fable (in an epimythium). In addition, fables impart acquaintance with the animals' nature to children.

Both the subsequent aetiological fable, explaining the divine origin of Aesop's fable-telling, and the allusion embedded in this fable[112]

---

[106] Cf. Peters 1946, 31-32.

[107] He does not demand that fables be short and clear, as Tzetzes reports (*H.* 11.131-132 (369)).

[108] ἀντὶ, misinterpreted by Baldwin (1928, 24) to mean "instead of"; rightly Reche Martínez 1991, 177: "a modo de".

[109] For the vexed question of "the Philostrati and their literary production", see Flinterman, J.-J., *Power,* Paideia *& Pythagoreanism. Greek Identity, Conceptions of the Relationship between Philosophers and Monarchs, and Political Ideas in Philostratus'* Life of Apollonius, Amsterdam: Gieben 1995, 55sqq; cf. *Sudam,* φ 421-423 Adler; Anderson, G., *Philostratus. Biography and belles lettres in the third* [p. III; p. IV: *second*] *century A.D.*, London...: Croom Helm 1986, 291-296.

[110] Photius (*Bibl.* 241) quotes only from its beginning (333b16-21) and its end (329a23-27).

[111] He mentions only frogs and asses, who do not generally play glorious roles in fables. Bolte-Polívka (1912-1932, IV 44) take Menippus to refer to fairy-tales.

[112] Adrados (1993a, 127; 1994, 43) considers fables-within-fables to be typically *Indian*; see Van Dijk 1995a, 251.

(*Aes.* T62), are told to children (to Apollonius by his mother, and to Hermes by his nurses, respectively). In the fable, human beings and a god (Hermes[113]) figure as characters. The unknown[114] fable which is alluded to is about a Cow, a Man, and the Earth.

G43 Philostr. (II/III ?) *Im.* 1.3

After mentioning Homer, Hesiod and Archilochus as fabulists (see below, 1. Hom., 2F1, 4F1-2), the author states the moral (λόγου ἕνεκεν) and didactic function of Aesop's fables: animals are gifted with speech (λόγου) to criticize men's vices and to teach children how life is. Philostratus describes an allegorical painting which represents the fables honouring the wise Aesop. Both Philostratus and the painter know that a fabulist needs a relaxed mind. The picture represents the fable characters by a choir of animals and human beings, which is headed by the fox, the protagonist of the genre (like Daon of comedy).[115]

G44 Alex. Aphr. *in Mete.* 2.3

Commenting upon Aesop's quasi-aetiological fable in Aristotle's *Meteorologica* (57F1), Alexander remarks that those seeking the truth should not tell fables, but an angry man may.

G45 *PMich.* 6

This fragmentary rhetorical papyrus defines fable[116] as "an untrue narrative having as the purpose of its composition the exhortation of one who is downcast in spirit to a praiseworthy life". The anonymus also enumerates eight "starting points" (κεφα[λ]ων; viz. of the refutation of a given fable)[117]; in comparison with Theon's list (G20c), five are omitted (c, f, h, j, k) and two added ("the impossible" and "the disgraceful"). In the course of a (lacunal) discussion of these points of

---

113 Not Apollo, as Jedrkiewicz (1989, 55) asserts. The fable is alluded to by Lorichius (1542, 10).

114 See Van Dijk 1994a, 103. Phillimore (J.S., *Philostratus. In Honour of Apollonius of Tyana*, II, Oxford: Clarendon P 1912, 262) suggests that "this story is perhaps borrowed from Lucian's *Demonax* 64", which is, however, probably not the case.

115 This is misunderstood by Nøjgaard (1964, 308) and Jedrkiewicz (1989, 56). Guter (1972, 27-28) speculates that the 1476 frontispiece of Steinhöwel's "Ulmer Esopus" goes back to Philostratus' ἔκφρασις.

116 Not "myth" (Winter 1922, 139; Smith 1974, 139). The translation is Winter's.

117 Not "the elements of the myth" (Winter 1922, 141).

attack, the first ("obscurity") is exemplified by an allusion to the dog fable to which Theon alluded also.

G46 Eust. Antioch. *Engast.* 29

In his *On the Witch of Endor* [LXX 1. *Ki* 28.8] *against Origen*, after having quoted in approval the rejection of mendacious fiction like Homer's epics and Hesiod's myths from Plato's *Republic* (2, 376-377), Eustathius polemically (and disapprovingly) compares Aesop's fictitious fable-telling to playing boys' jokes and Corybantic old women's chatter.

G47 Mar. Victor. *Rhet.* 1.17

In his commentary on the *De inventione*, Marius Victorinus paraphrases Cicero's advice (G8) to the orator to keep a myth (*fabula*) or fable (*apologus*), relevant to the case at hand, in reserve to provoke the judges' laughter. He adds that fables have ordinary subject matter and are true to life, and exemplifies[118] the genre by a beast fable (the Mouse and the Lion; *Aes.* 150)[119].

G48 Fortun. *Rhet.* 2.23

The rhetorician C. Chirius Fortunatianus ranks fables among the *loci circa rem*[120] *a simili*, i.e. fables can be used in a speech as arguments by drawing a comparison

G49 Iul. Vict. *Rhet.* 6.3

Like the preceding testimony, Iulius Victor ranks fables among the *loci circa rem a simili*. He adds that the subject matter of fables is well-known and vulgar.

G50 Jul. *Or.* 7.3, 207a-d

In his oration *To the Cynic Heraclius*, the Roman Emperor opposes the

[118] Cf Hadot, P , *Marius Victorinus Recherches sur sa vie et ses œuvres*, Paris Études Augustiniennes 1971, 78

[119] Babr 107, Ps-Dos 2, *Tab Ass* 9, Lib *Ep.* 47.16, Jul. *Ep* 8, 377D; *fab aes* 155 Hausrath, Branc 6, *Pa.Bodl* 207 Chambry, Rom 22 Thiele, *Syr* XXVII, 29 Lefèvre, Ahrens 1920, Adrados 1987a, 165-167, 484 (medieval versions, to which Engelmodus, *Carm* 1 103-104 may be added)

[120] Not *a re*, as asserted by Freytag 1985, 79. For the term, see Calboli Montefusco, L , *Consulti Fortunatiani Ars Rhetorica*, Bologna Patron 1979, *ad loc.*

audience and function of the fable and the fairy-tale (μύθου)[121]. The former is told to men, the latter to children; the latter has an amusing function only, the former a hortatory and didactic function besides. Julian sees the use of fables as a concealed way of speaking to evade the enmity of the addressed, and mentions Hesiod and Archilochus (see 2F1, 4F1-3) in this connection.[122] Julian praises the peerless master of the genre, Aesop, whose slavery was intentional, not accidental[123]. As a slave, he could not speak outright but had to disguise his counsels in elegant terms.[124]

G51 Jul. *Or.* 10, 306c

Julian contrasts Aesop's "ancient"[125] fables with myths but does not mention any differences.

G52 Aus. *Ep.* 9 Green

Ausonius sends Probus a copy of Titian's prose fables[126] and Nepos' *Chronica*, which resemble fables (*quasi alios apologos*; *instar sunt fabularum*[127]), to contribute to the education of his children. The accompanying iambs express his wish that the fables, between fairy tales and lullabies, will accustom the addressee's son to laugh and learn simultaneously.

G53 Aus. *Ep.* 12 Green (Symm. *Ep.* 1.32)

Singing Symmachus' praises, Ausonius brackets "the charm of Aesop" together with, nay even before, "the logical deductions of

---

[121] Cf. Bolte-Polívka, ibid. Copied by *Suda* Aι 230 Adler and Σ (Ald) *in* Ar. *V.* 1259c; cf. Scaliger 1561, 138. Wright (1913 II *passim*) may be right in translating "myth" (but probably not in deriving (ib. 81, n. 1) the subsequent passage from Pl. G3), but the passage is, at any rate, misunderstood by Nøjgaard 1964, 551.

[122] Lasserre's "traduction légèrement retouchée" (1984, 95, n. 27) misinterprets this passage.

[123] Copied by Ar. 17T29 (*Suda*). Connected by Perry (1952, 14) with *Vit. Aesop.* G40a.

[124] Plan. (*Prooem. Vit. Aesop.* (*Aes.* T2)), however, referring to Pl. *Grg.*, opposes Aesop's physical servitude and mental freedom; cf. Jedrkiewicz on "La schiavitù filosofica" (1989, 205-207).

[125] παλαιῶν. Cf. D.S. 38F1.4 λόγον ... τῶν παραδεδομένων μὲν καὶ παλαιῶν; Nic. 3F1.343 ὠγύγιος...μῦθος; Baldo, *fab. sup. Prol.* (V 339 Hervieux) *Artis...prisce.*

[126] Many (e.g. Fabricius 1718, pp. CXII; Oldaker 1933/1934, 88) take these to go back to Babrius, Herrmann (1971, 678-686) and Luzzatto (1984, 80) to Phaedrus, whereas Green (*ad loc.*) joins the "judicious *non liquet*" of Thraede (K., "Zu Ausonius Ep. 16,2 (Schn.)", *Hermes* 96, 1968, 613.

[127] See the next chapter, 2.5.

Isocrates, the arguments of Demosthenes", Cicero's "richness", and Virgil's "felicity"; in all "liberal arts"[128] Symmachus is peerless.

G54 Aphth. *Prog.* 1[129]

As in Hermogenes (G41), the fable is Aphthonius' first *progymnasma.* Aphthonius ascribes the origin of the genre to the poets, and reports that it is frequently used by rhetoricians to give an advice.

Aphthonius borrows Theon's fable[130] definition[131] (G20a and c), without mentioning its provenance. The remark that Aesop wrote down his fables better than anybody else[132] seems to imply that in the time of Aphthonius fables circulated in writing, not orally.

Aphthonius classifies fables by using their characters as a criterion. He distinguishes "rational" fables (λογικόν; with human characters), "moral" fables (ἠθικόν; with non-rational characters), and "mixed" fables (composed of both).[133]

Aphthonius states that fables have a hortatory function, which can be expressed in a promythium or epimythium. Finally, he exemplifies his "moral" category by the famous[134] fable of the Cicada(s) and the

---

128 Translations by Evelyn White H.G., *Ausonius*, II, Loeb, 1921 (repr. 1961), 7, 9.

129 Tz. *H.* 11.133-141 (369) is a testimony to Aphthonius' theoretical testimony. For the so-called Aphthonian *Preface* to the *Collectio Augustana*, see the Appendix below.

130 Not "mito" (Pignani 1983, 19, not mentioning Theon either).

131 Likewise anon. *Prog. Aphth.* (I 127-128 Walz), Matth. Camar. *Epit.* (I 122 Walz), and Plan. *in fab. aes.* 1 (Hausrath 1901, 93-94). Josifović (1961, 99) misquotes the definition.

132 This enfeebles Holzberg's assertion (1993, 82) "daß außer dem Asop-Roman [G40c] samtliche antike Testimonien, die den λογοποιός erwahnen, lediglich von mundlicher Erzahlung der λόγοι καὶ μῦθοι durch Àsop wissen".

133 Mombello (1987, 176) takes Aphthonius' classification to refer to "trois éléments de la fable". Aphthonius' classification is borrowed by Matth. Camar. and Plan. *in fab. aes.*, rephrased by anon. *Prog. Aphth.*, and subdivided by Lessing (see Fischer 1891, 40). Pomey (1665, 10; cf. Wolff, *Phil. Pract.* 314 (Harth 1978, 52, n. 32)) translates λογικοί, ἠθικοί, μικτοί by *Rationales, Morales* [differently Scaliger 1561, 139: *ab affectu*], *Mixtae*; Nadeau (R., "The Progymnasmata of Aphthonius in Translation", *Speech Monographs* 19, 1952, 265) by "verbal", "moral", "combined"; likewise Reche Martínez 1991, 217. Clark (1952, 262; cf. Butts, J.R.-Hock, in: id.-O'Neil 1986, 215) lists sixteenth- and seventeenth-century Latin translations of Aphthonius by Catanaeus, Agricola, Lorich, Bonfine, Camerarius, Harbart, Scobarius, De Comitibus, Heinsius, Praetorius, and Schefferus.

134 Babr. 140 (Ps.-Dos. 17); Avian. 34; *fab. aes.* 114 (Ib, III) Hausrath; Synt. 43; *Syr.* XL, 40 Lefèvre; *Pa.Bodl.* 336 Chambry; Dod. ibid.; Rom. 93 Thiele; Branc. 14; *Tetr.* 1.6, 2.25; Thphyl. *Ep.* 61; Doxap. *Comm. in* Aphth. 2.177-190 Walz; Adrados 1987a, 123-125, 466 (medieval versions; *addenda*: Tz. *H.* 11.135-137 (369); Psel. *Orat.* 25.51-53, 83-84, 88-91; Jo. Sard. *in* Aphth., p. 8, 10-13 Rabe; Σ *in* Aphth. 1.8, 1.25, 1.26);

Ant(s) (*Prog.* 1; *Aes.* 373). This exemplification has a clear hortatory function and is provided with both a promythium and an epimythium (as are all forty fables in Aphthonius' collection).

G55 Him. *Or.* 46.4-5

In his speech *Against Basilius*, Himerius reports that not only Aesop's fables, but also his face and voice[135], provoked laughter. Nevertheless, Aesop is higly praised.

G56 Him. *Or.* 66

Himerius' speech *Against some rebellious pupils* consists of a lengthy fable (*Aes.* 432). In its introduction Himerius asserts that the genre originated in Phrygia[136] (Aesop's alleged birth-place, besides Thrace, Lydia, and Samos). Himerius' fable is about gods and mountains. Two parentheses defend the occurrence of these characters in fables by comparing the epic poets. First, Aesop introduces gods in his fables with a wise, deeper meaning, and is to be preferred to Homer in this respect. Secondly, one must not wonder that fables attribute the faculty of speech to mountains, since Hesiod provides them with comparable power.[137]

G57 Them. *Or.* 22, 278c

In this speech, Themistius introduces a beast fable (the Lion and the Bulls; *Aes.* 372)[138] by remarking that it is always useful to mention Aesop. In fables the fox is always[139] cunning, as Themistius' fable exemplifies.

---

cf. Anhegger, R., "Die Fabel von der Grille und der Ameise in der Türkischen Literatur", *Asiatische Studien* 3, 1949, 30-47.

[135] For "la ridicolaggine fisica di Esopo", see Jedrkiewicz 1989, 70; cf. above, *Vit. Aesop.* G40a.

[136] Not Egypt, as Brunner-Traut (1955, 14) asserts. Perry (1952, 215-216) lists testimonies "de patria Aesopi".

[137] Cf. Him. *Or.* 47.9; Hes. *Th.* 22-35.

[138] Other versions occur in Babr. 44, Aphth. 16 (Themistius' source according to Colpi, B., *Die παιδεία des Themistios*, Bern...: Lang 1987, 181), Avian. 18, *Pa.Bodl.* 71 Chambry, Synt. 13, *Syr.* XVI and 18 Lefèvre, and *Tetr.* 1.11; see Adrados 1987a, 365-366, 479 (medieval versions).

[139] Schwarzbaum, H. "The Vision of Eternal Peace in the Animal Kingdom (AA-Th 62)", *Fabula* 10, 1969, 125-131 (repr. in: id. 1979, 42-47)), however, lists fables in which the fox is outfoxed.

G58 Sopat. Rh. *Prog.*

Byzantine scholiasts on Aphthonius[140] have preserved the rhetorician Sopater's fable definition: "A fable is a fictitious but possible story (πλάσμα) which is plausibly composed in order to give the semblance of the things which happen in reality, which gives people some advice or somehow illustrates reality." Sopater's definition rewords Theon's (G20a and c), while adding the plausibility and functions of fable.

Sopater amplifies his definition point by point. He explains that plausibility is to be achieved by keeping to the animals' true or alleged stereotype character, and exemplifies the verisimilitude of fables as well as their illustrative and persuasive function by four allusions to fables[141]. Two of these exemplifications have both human and animal characters, whereas the other two have animal characters only.

G59 Avian. *Praef.*

In the prefatory letter[142] to his fable collection, Avianus explains his literary activity in this field by referring to the genre convention which allows fabulists to write fiction, if elegantly conceived.

Sketching the history of the genre, Avianus mentions three fabulists (Aesopus, Babrius, and Phaedrus[143]), and reports that Socrates

[140] Jo. Sard. *in* Aphth. (pp. 6-7 Rabe); Doxap. *Comm. in* Aphth. (pp. 161-162 Walz). For the status of Σ *in* Theon. (I 259 Walz), see Rabe.

[141] *Aes.* 133, 140 (references given below, Democr. 47A1, nn. 44-45, and D.S. 38F1, n. 71, respectively), 397 (Aphth. 4 (*fab. aes.* 316 Hausrath)), 188/358 (Luc. *Fug.* 13, 33, *Philops.* 5, *Pisc.* 32, *Pseud.* 3; Babr. 139; Aphth. 10; Lib. *Or.* 18.19; Them. *Or.* 21, 245ab; Avian. 5; *fab. aes.* 199 Hausrath; Nicol. *Prog.* 1.2; *Pa.Bodl.* 280 Chambry; *Tetr.* 1.19, 2.23; Eust. *Il.* Γ 17; Doxap. *in* Aphth. (II 172-173 Walz); Tz. *H.* 932-936 (10), 10.254-255 (321), *Ep.* 1, 67 (pp. 2, 97 Leone); Theod. Prodr. *Or. paup. Prov.* (*Notices...* VIII.2.85); Nicet. Chon. *Hist.* (p. 61 Van Dieten), *Or.* 14 (p. 139 Van Dieten); *Anecd. Gr.* III 223 Cramer; Mazar. *Dial. fun.* (p. 156 Boissonade); Arsen. 36.6 (Apostol. 11.89a); Erasm. *Mor. enc.* 5, 49; Luria 1934; Adrados 1987a, 202-203; Schmidt 1987 (none complete)).

[142] Referred to by Conr. Hirs. *Dial. super Avian.*; discussed by Lomanto 1982. Theodosius, the addressee, is identified with Macrobius (Unrein 1885, 59-61; Cameron 1967, 386-389, pointing to correspondences between Avian. G59 and Macr. G60 (see Lomanto 1982, 307-308); Kuppers 1977, 48-57; Gaide *ad loc.*), Theodosius I (Jones 1969), or II (Luzzatto 1984, 89-90). Herrmann (1968, 27-28; 1969, 669-670) detects verse in the prose preface (criticism listed by (e.g.) Lomanto 1982, 297, n. 2). Bentley (1699, 226), De Furia (1810, p. XXIII) and Lecomte (1995, 18) spell "Avienus", Froehner (W., "Kritische Analekten", *Philologus, Suppl.* 5, 1889, 60-61) "Avianius", Jones (lc) "Flavianus"; see Kuppers ib. 10-28; Gaide 1980, 7-12.

[143] This is the first reliable reference to Phaedrus (Mart. 3.20.5 is problematic; see the next chapter, n. 26). Holzberg (1993, 71-72) discusses conflicting views about Avian's source (Babrius or/and Phaedrus?).

(46T5) and Horace (cf. above, Quint. G18b) used fables as *exempla* in a literary context, because fables amuse and teach at the same time: fables relieve anxiety and provide insight in the reality of life. Finally, Avianus notices that in fables trees, beasts, and human beings occur as characters, all behaving like men.

G60 Macr. *Comm.* 1.2.7-11

Commenting upon Cicero's *Dream of Scipio*, Macrobius subdivides different kinds of *fabulae*.[144] *Fabulae* can be either (1) exclusively amusing, like comedies and romances, or (2) amusing and edifying at the same time. The contents of the latter can be either (2.1) entirely fictitious, like fables, or (2.2) fictitious but based upon reality, like myths (*narratio fabulosa*). The narrative of the latter can be either (2.2.1) dishonourable or (2.2.2) honourable. Macrobius praises the elegance of fables, but deems them unsuitable for philosophical works, in which only 2.2.2 is allowed.

G61 Syn. *Insomn.* 19, 154D-155A

In his *On Dreams*, Synesius derives the faculty of speech which fables grant to their characters from dreams. He exemplifies fable characters by animals and an element (the Sea)[145]. Synesius knows that the genre is held in high esteem by the rhetoricians for use in preparatory education, but he deems these linguistic exercises empty.

G62 Mart. Cap. 5.49 (558)

In *The Wedding of Philology and Mercury*, Martianus Capella adopts Fortunatianus' classification of fables (G48) among the *loci circa rem a simili*, which can be used in an argumentation.

G63 Aug. *c. mend. ad Consent.* 28

Having defined a parable (exemplified by the Prodigal Son (*Ev.Luc.*

[144] Elucidated by Powell (1983, 50); misunderstood by Demandt (1991, 399); (partially) copied by Joachim Vadianus (*De poetica et carminis ratione*, 1513/1514, ed. Schäfer, P., Munchen 1973, I 119; see Freytag 1986, 12). Regali (M., *Macrobio. Commento al* Somnium Scipionis. *Libro I*, Pisa: Giardini 1983, 221) may be right in attributing the absence of any mention of Phaedrus to Macrobius' dependence on Porph. *in* P. *R.*, but not so much when stating that "il giudizio molto positivo che Macrobio dà di Esopo...trova conferma anche in...Quintiliano", in view of G18b above.

[145] For my suggestion that this is an allusion to *Aes.* 168 (Babr. 71; *fab. aes.* 178 Hausrath; *Pa.Bodl.* 247 Chambry; *Dod.* ibid.; Adrados 1987a, 186), see Van Dijk 1995a, 254.

15.11)) as a metaphorical story about unreal events presented as real, Augustine (*Against mendacity*) classes fables in the same genre of fiction. He says that in fables men depict animals and lifeless objects anthropomorphically, to emphasize what they want to say by a fictitious narrative which has a veracious signification. Therefore, only an unlearned man would consider Aesop's fables to be untruths.[146] Augustine exemplifies the genre by allusions to two secular animal fables from Horace (*S.* 2.6.79-117 (*Aes.* 352)[147]; *Ep.* 1.7.29-33 (*Aes.* 24)[148]), and one Biblical plant fable from the book of *Judges* (9.8-15; *Aes.* 262)[149].

G64a Nicol. *Prog.* 1

Nicolaus[150] explains the position of the fable as the first *progymnasma* by pointing to its natural simplicity, which links up best with the young pupils' previous training.

Nicolaus begins his chapter on fable by defining the genre: "A fable is a fictitious story which, by being plausibly composed, gives the semblance of the reality." This is, in fact, Theon's definition (G20a and c)[151] with two additions. First, Nicolaus adds the definite article to ἀλήθεια. Secondly, he stresses plausibility of content, which, he explains, achieves the semblance to the reality which is, in

---

[146] Powell 1983, 54: "Aesop is drawn into the orbit of authors acceptable for a Christian audience." Cf. Fontaine (1959, 180) on Isid. G75.

[147] Country Mouse and City Mouse, "le chef d'œuvre de la fable" according to Denis 1883, 256 (cf. De Gennaro-Ferrigni 1899, 16-17). See Albini 1903; Archibald 1910, pp. XVIIIsq; Jacob 1935; Kühn 1987; Holzberg 1991; Carlson 1992; Warmuth 1992, 119-125. Other versions: Babr. 108, Ps.-Dos. 16, Aphth. 26 (*fab. aes.* 314 Hausrath), Pseudacr. *in* Hor. lc, *Pa.Bodl.* 245 Chambry, Dod. ibid., *fab. dact.* 10 Crusius, Rom. 15 Thiele, Rom. Vind. *Epil.*, Prisc. G70, Isid. G75; Erasm. *Adag.* p. 843E; Adrados 1987a, 377-378, 511 (medieval versions; both incomplete).

[148] Fox (Weasel) with Swollen Belly; see Warmuth 1992, 28-37. Other versions: Babr. 86, *fab. aes.* 24 Hausrath, Hiër. *Ep.* 79.3, Porph. *in* Hor. lc, *Pa.Bodl.* 30 Chambry, *Tetr.* 1.27, *fab. dact.* 22 Crusius, Rom. Vind. *Epil.*, Greg. Tur. *HF* 4.9, Isid. G75, Cyrill. *Spec. Sap.* 3.11 (pp. 85-86 Grässe), Leon. Dati 18; Adrados 1987a, 51-52 (incomplete).

[149] Trees Electing a King, studied by Rothstein 1912; Van Imschoot 1935; Maly 1960; Simon 1964. The fable occurs also in J. *AJ* 5.236-238 (7.2) (see Van Dijk 1993b, 32; 1994b, 128-129, nn. 99-112), Greg. Naz. *Poem. Mor.* 2.12.723; *fab. aes.* 262 Hausrath; Isid. G75; Conr. Hirs. *Dial. super Hesopum*); cf. Adrados 1987a, 269-270, 432 (medieval versions; both incomplete).

[150] From Myra; not from Damascus, as Chambry (1960, p. XXXII) asserts.

[151] Cf. (in general) Felten, J., *De Nicolai praeexercitamentis*, Diss. Leipzig: Teubner 1913, p. XXIX: "concedes Nicolaum Theonis libro usum esse", but cf. Grabbe, L.L.-Hock, in: id.-O'Neil 1986, 241.

its turn, indispensable for the effectiveness of the fable. His subsequent terminological discussion shows that human beings and animals can be fable characters, but that he regards stories about gods as another genre, viz. myths. Nicolaus then expounds that the desired plausibility can be obtained by depicting the animal characters (eight different species are mentioned) in their natural regions and seasons and attributing natural words and acts to them. Each unnatural element in the plot, if at all required, must be accounted for previously in the fable.

Nicolaus then deals with the relation between the fable and the three oratorical *genera*. He assigns the fable to deliberative speeches because of its persuasive function. He quotes some anonymous rival theoreticians who assign the fable also to judicial speeches because of its moral function, and to demonstrative speeches because of its pure and simple style and its laudatory function. Nicolaus, however, underlines his own view, and adds the explanation that fables are a combination of entertainment and moral benefit.

As regards the five parts of an oration, fables are a preliminary exercise for the *narratio* (διήγησις), because their very fictitiousness teaches how to relate events.

Thereupon, Nicolaus discusses the epimythium, which he defines as "a statement [λόγος] enunciated after the fable and revealing its useful message." He distinguishes and exemplifies three kinds of epimythia, viz. (1) exemplifying, (2) enthymematic, and (3) addressing the audience.[152] He polemizes against those using promythia, by quoting with approval those who point to the very fact that young people are unwilling to listen to straightforward lessons and that fables are invented to persuade them by amusing and cheating them first and *then* expressing their useful message.[153]

Finally, Nicolaus gives some stylistic prescriptions. The style of fables must be simple. Intrigue must be absent. Periods must be avoided. Thus, the meaning will be clear and the words will match the characters, especially in beast fables[154].

---

[152] This tripartition is borrowed by anon. *Prog. Aphth.*, Σ *in* Theon. *Prog.* (I 127-128, 259-260 Walz).

[153] Likewise Houdar de La Motte 1719, 69-70 (cf. Pascal 1995, 24-25); conversely, Dodsley (1764, pp. LXIIsq) fervently advocates the use of promythia instead of epimythia.

[154] Contra Jedrkiewicz (1989, 266, n. 30), who paraphrases: "Nicolao aggiunge che, in particolare, deve tenersi a mente che gli attuanti sono 'animali irrazionali'".

G64b Nicol. *Prog.* 2

In his discussion of the *diegema*, Nicolaus distinguishes fable from myth and drama: whereas myths are presented as having really happened, fables are obviously fictitious; dramas are fictitious, too, but could possibly happen, whereas fables could not.

G64c Nicol. *Prog.* 3

Discussing the *chreia*, Nicolaus remarks that it makes no sense to refute fables (as some do (and Theon[155] taught (G20c)), as their obvious fictitiousness is commonly accepted and as they are composed in view of something good.

G65 Σ *in* Hes. *Op.* 202a

This scholium (by Proclus ?) on Hesiod's fable of the Hawk and the Nightingale (2F1) defines the genre: "a fable is a proverbial story, which is told to exhort".[156]

G66a Σ *in* Ar. *Av.* 471b[157]

By its very restriction of the characters of Aesopic and Sybaritic fables to non-rational and human beings, respectively, this scholium on Aristophanes' *Birds* (G2) implicitly indicates that both groups can be fable characters.

G66b Σ *in* Ar. *Av.* 651b

See the next chapter, 4.1.

G67a Σ *in* Ar. *V.* 1182a

This scholium on Aristophanes' *Wasps*, commenting upon the fable which Philocleon had started to tell but Bdelycleon did not want to listen to (17F1; see above, G1b), reports that οὕτω(ς) is commonly used as an introductory fable formula.

G67b Σ *in* Ar. *V.* 1259a

Another scholium on Aristophanes' *Wasps* (G1c), like that on *Birds* discussed above (G66a), implicitly recognizes that both animals and

---

[155] This is not to say that Nicolaus' remarks are directed against Theon rather than against authors of *Progymnasmata* which are no longer extant (Hock-O'Neil 1986, 241-245 (Grabbe, L.L.-Hock)).

[156] Cf. Phlp. *Dif. Ton.* sv Αἶνος.

[157] Likewise Ar. 17T63a (Erasm.).

humans occur as fable characters, although its restrictive definitions of Sybaritic and Aesopic fables diametrically oppose those by the aforesaid testimony. The scholiast adds that these fables were πολιτικοί, which may mean "used in (speaking in) public, in politics".

G68 Σ *in* Od. 14.508

See the next chapter, 1.1.

G69a Hsch. α 2159 Latte

According to Hesychius' *Lexicon*, "something comical of Aesop" (see above, Ar. G1a) refers to Aesop's fables. Hesychius adds that fables were sometimes used in public courts.[158]

G69b Hsch. λ 946 Latte

See the next chapter, 1.2, 5.5.

G69c Hsch. μ 1805 Latte

Another lemma of Hesychius' lexicon copies Theon's definition of the genre (G20a and c), adding (like Nicolaus (G64a)) the definite article to ἀλήθειαν.

G69d Hsch. σ 2131 Schmidt

See the next chapter, 1.2, 5.8.

G70 Prisc. *Praeex.* 1

This is a Latin translation of the first chapter of Hermogenes' *Progymnasmata*[159] (G41). Priscian deviates from his source in that he prefixes a translation of Nicolaus' definition[160] (G64a), adds an allusion to a Latin beast fable[161], and expresses (like Nicolaus) his preference for epimythia to promythia.

G71 Agath. *AP* 16.332

In this epigram Agathias interprets Lysippus'[162] statue representing Aesop in front of the Seven Sages as an allegory of the superiority of

[158] These two sentences are combined by *App. Prov.* 1.11.

[159] Not Aphthonius', as asserted by De Furia 1810, p. XXII, n. 1.

[160] Not Hermogenes', as Lomanto (1982, 306) suggests by not mentioning Nicolaus. I fail to see that "Priscian includes humour in his definition of *fabula*", as Powell (1983, 51) asserts.

[161] Horace's Country and City Mice (see above, Aug. G63).

[162] Not Lysias' (contra Fusillo 1988, 31).

Aesop's gentle persuasion by means of wise, fictitious fables, combining jest and earnest, to their compulsory method.[163]

G72 Olymp. *In Grg.* 49.3

Commenting upon Plato's *Gorgias*, Olympiodorus says that the deductions (ἀποδείξεις "demonstrations") which he praises in philosophical myths imitate the epimythia of fables.[164]

G73 anon. *Prol. Phil. Pl.* 2.7

This anonymous philosophical treatise, which glorifies Plato, criticizes fables because children have to wait for the epimythium when they want to learn the use of the fable, whereas in Plato's myths the benefit is apparent from the very beginning.

G74a Rom. *Praef.* 1 (*recc. gall./vet.*)[165]

The first dedicatory epistle, purportedly addressed by Romulus[166] to his son[167] Tiberinus, states that fables are short and have a moral, didactic, and comical function and feature talking birds, beasts, and trees.

G74b Rom. *Praef.* 2 (*recc. gall./vet.*)

The second preface[168], allegedly written by Aesop to Rufus (most

---

[163] Perry (1962, 318) takes this to allude to the fable of Πειθὼ καὶ Βία (Them. *Or.* 16, 208a), a variant version of Boreas and Helios (*Aes.* 46), allegedly hinted at by Sophocles (24A1). Viansino (G., *Agazia scolastico. Epigrammi*, Milano: Trevisini 1967, 57), comparing Plu. *Mor.* 69CD and Luc. *Peregr.* 3, notes that 7 τραχεῖα indicates that Agathias is criticizing the Cynics in particular. Viansino (ib. 58) observes also that 5 πλάσμασι is "prosastico".

[164] Cf. ibid. 4.3 τοὺς μύθους λαμβάνομεν διὰ τὰ ἐπιμύθια; 34.4 κεφαλὴ δὲ τοῦ μύθου τὸ ἐπιμύθιον· αὐτὸ γὰρ τὸ ἀληθὲς τὸ κεκρυμμένον ἐν τῷ μύθῳ διδάσκει, ὃ ἐχρῆν καὶ τοὺς ποιητικοὺς ἔχειν, καὶ οὐκ ἂν ἠπατώμεθα εὐθέως τὴν ἀλήθειαν μανθάνοντες. For ἀποδείξεις, cf. above, Arist. G5.

[165] Copied by Vinc. Bell. *Prol.* (II 234 Hervieux).

[166] The impersonated first king (Holzberg 1993, 109), rather than the last emperor, of Rome (*Rom. Nilant. Praef.* (Hervieux 1893-1899, II 514); Marie de France, *Prol.* 12 (Brucker, C., *Marie de France. Les Fables*, Louvain: Peeters 1991, 48-49)), nor an historical person (Oesterley 1870, p. XII; Thiele 1910, pp. XII-XIV).

[167] Not: his father (contra Adrados 1979a, 140). The question whether the (greater part of the) collection originates in an *Aesopus latinus* (Thiele 1910; Holzberg 1993, 105sqq), Phaedrus (Oesterley 1870, p. IX; cf. Zander 1897, 1921; Kuppers 1990, 24), an independent tradition (Nøjgaard 1967, 411), or a mixed source (Adrados 1985, 474), is a much-debated issue.

[168] Thiele (1910, pp. XIVsqq), Holbek (1962, 84) and Adrados (1985, 475) hold

probably a Latin translation of Ξανθός, Aesop's master in the *Vita*[169]) reports that his short fables, which are compared to a precious vase[170], have a moral and didactic function (cf. G74a).

G74c Rom. 26a Thiele (*recc. gall./vet.*)[171]

This preface to the second book of the Romulus collection, which draws upon two Phaedrian prologues (G13.1-3, G14.50), again (cf. G74ab) reports the genre's moral function.

G75 Isid. *Etym.* 1.40[172]

At the end of antiquity, Isidore of Sevilla dedicates a chapter to fable in his *Etymologies*. Fables, he says, are *per se* fictitious; they are used to give an image of human life by a fictitious conversation of dumb animals. Isidore's mention of Alcmaeon (44T1) of Croton as the first fabulist is isolated (but for *Romulus*' copy). Isidore states that the (speaking) characters in Aesopic fables are animals and lifeless things (including trees), whereas in Libyan fables animals and human beings talk to each other.

The function of *fabulae* can be (1) amusing, like comedies, (2) to give an allegorical representation of reality, like myths, and (3) moral, like fables. Isidore's exemplications of the third group are identical[173] with Augustine's (G63), just as his characterization of a fable as a fictitious narrative which has a veracious signification. In addition, Isidore retells a fable with animal and human characters allegedly used by Demosthenes in a political context (40F1).

Conclusion

Before comparing the information on the genre's definition and functions provided by the testimonies studied above, it has to be observed

---

that the second preface predates the first; Nøjgaard (1967, 414) argues that it is the other way round.

[169] Thiele 1910, p. XV; Zander 1921, p. XIII; Schnur 1978b, 7.

[170] *labium* = *labrum* (see Thiele 1910, 7).

[171] According to Thiele (1910, p. XVI) composed by the author of the first preface (G74a).

[172] Copied in *Access. Avian.* (p. 306 Huygens) and Rom. Vind. (Alcmaeon 44T2); followed by Conr. Hirs. *Dial. super Hesopum* [*sic*], p. 34 Schepss; translated in Steinhöwel's 1477 *Esopus* (see e.g. Lenaghan 1968, 5; Carnes 1986, 9; Derendorf 1996, 7-11).

[173] Freytag (1985, 75) confuses "Iudith 9,8" with *Judges* ibid.

that prudence is called for when combining them, in view of the great variety of their provenance and contents. On the other hand, although the lion's share of the theoretical passages extant (from Phaedr. G12 onwards) dates only from the Imperial Period, the existence of (at least some) continuity may be deduced from the fact that these rather late testimonies often exemplify (particular aspects of) the genre by older fables taken from, or occurring in, Archaic, Classical, or Hellenistic Greek, or Roman Republican, literature.

In some respects, a consensus seems to exist, in that particular characteristics of the genre are mentioned by many testimonies and negated by none:

1. Fables are fictitious. This is stated in all definitions of the genre[174] and by several other testimonies[175]. It is often[176] felt that fables should be true to nature to compensate for their fictitiousness.

2. Fables are metaphorical. This is apparent from several definitions[177], from Aristotle (G5), from the inclusion of fables among the *loci circa rem a simili* by three Roman rhetoricians[178], and (*a contrario*) from Theon's τόπος ἐκ τοῦ ἀνομοίου[179] (G20c).

3. Fables are stories. This is stated by some[180] testimonies and apparent from the exemplifications given by several others[181].

---

[174] Theon G20a, c (*PMich.* G45; Aphth. G54; Sopat. Rh. G58; Nicol. G64a; Hsch. G69c; Prisc. G70); Luc. Tarrh. G21 (Herenn. Ph. G27; Ps.-Diogenian. G28; Ptol. Ascal. G37); Aug. G63; Isid. G75; cf. Arist. 57T4 (Bocc.) *omnino ueritate caret in cortice*; Cyrill. *Spec. Sap. Expl.* (p. 121 Grasse): *sermo dubius vel fictus*; Apostol. *Praef.* 5 ἐκ δημιουργημάτων; Baldo, *fab. sup. Prol.* (V 339 Hervieux).

[175] Pl. G3, Arist. G5, Phaedr. G12, G14, Quint. G18b, Plu. G24b, Gell. G31 (*commentus*), Tat. G38, Hermog. G41, Philostr. G42, Eust. Antioch. G46, Avian. G59, Macr. G60, Nicol. G64bc, Agath. G71; cf. e.g. Nov. Avian. Ast. 1.13 *fingat*, Lorichium (1542, 20): *figmento*.

[176] Theon G20c, Hermog. G41, Aphth. G54, Sopat. Rh. G58, Nicol. G64a, Hsch. G69c, Prisc. G70; cf. Max. Tyr. G34, Mar. Victor. G47, Aug. G63, Isid. G75; cf. Jo. Geom. *ap.* Doxap. *in* Aphth. (II 159 Walz): τὸ κατὰ φύσιν ἀλλ' οὐ τὸ κατ' ἐνέργειαν τὸ ψευδὲς ἔχειν τὸν μῦθον; Σ *in* Aphth. (ib. 12).

[177] Theon G20a, c (Aphth. G54; Sopat. Rh. G58; Nicol. G64a; Hsch. G69c; Prisc. G70; cf. Max. Tyr. G34; Stesich. 7T2 (Conon) εἰκόνα); Aug. G63; Isid. G75.

[178] Fortun. G48, Iul. Vict. G49, Mart. Cap. G62. Cf. [*similis*] in Ps.-Dos., p. 42 Goetz; Rom. 11, 19, 43, 68 Thiele; Liv. G11; ibid.: *Comparando*; anon. Avian. 42 *figurat*; *Rom. Nilant. fab. rhythm. Prol.* (II 714 Hervieux) *per metaphoram*; Conr. Hirs. *Dial. super Avian.*: *comparatione, similitudine*.

[179] Cf. Matth. Camar. *Epit.* (I 122 Walz) ἐξ ὁμοιώσεως; Ps.-Dos., p. 42 Goetz ομοια.

[180] Cic. G9, Aug. G63, Prisc. G70, Rom. G74ab, Isid. G75 [*narratio/narrare*]; Nicol. G64a (διηγεῖσθαι).

[181] Arist. G5, Phaedr. G15b, Quint. G18a, Babr. G19c, Theon G20c, Ps.-Diogenian. G28, Gell. G31, Max. Tyr. G33-34, Hermog. G41, Philostr. G42, *PMich.*

In other respects, however, opposing views are held.

1. Fable characters. Many passages witness (either explicitly[182] or implicitly[183]) that fables may feature non-rational characters (animals, plants, objects). Some testimonies[184], however, allow *only* non-rational characters. However, the occurrence of rational fable characters (human beings, gods) is stated by some other testimonies[185] and apparent from some exemplifications[186], one of which contradicts the previous (and aforesaid) restriction of fable characters by the author concerned (Ps.-Diogenian. G28). On the other hand, one testimony (Nicol. G64a) explicitly relegates gods to the realm of myth.

2. The function(s) of fable. Various functions[187], and combinations of functions, are mentioned:

a. Fables are often[188] said to have a persuasive function (πείθω, παραινέω; *suadere*)[189], which is even part of several definitions[190] and

---

G45, Aphth. G54, Him. G56; cf. the definitions by Luc. Tarrh. G21, Herenn. Ph. G27, as well as all exemplifications given.

[182] Phaedr. G12; Babr. G19a; Theon G20c; Plu. G25a, G25c, G26; Max. Tyr. G33-35; Σ *in* Il. G36; Philostr. G42-43; Aphth. G54; Avian. G59; Syn. G61 (including elements); Nicol. G64a.

[183] Exemplifications given by Arist. G5, Demetr. G10, Phaedr. G15b, Quint. G18b (including members of the human body), D.Chr. G22, Plu. G25b, Gell. G31, Mar. Victor. G47, Him. G56 (elements), Them. G57, Sopat. Rh. G58, Prisc. G70; cf. e.g. Melanchthon *Util. fab.* (col. 118 Bretschneider).

[184] Luc. Tarrh. G21; Herenn. Ph. G27; Ps.-Diogenian. G28; Ptol. Asc. G37; Aug. G63; Isid. G75; Σ *in* Ar. G66a (in Aesopic fables), G67b (in Sybaritic fables); Rom. G74a; Arist. 57T4 (Bocc.); cf. Cyrill. *Spec. Sap. Expl.* (p. 121 Grasse); *Nov. Avian. Prol.*8 (III 371 Hervieux); *Rom. Nilant. fab. rhythm. Prol.* (II 714 Hervieux); *Rom. Angl. Prol.* (II 564 Hervieux); *Praef. fab. Aes.* (*Aes.* T1(ab); Rinuc. *Comm. Vit. Aesop.* (Lockwood 1913, 71).

[185] Babr. G19a, c; Theon G20c; Max. Tyr. G32-33; Philostr. G43; Aphth. G54; Him. G56; Avian. G59; Nicol. G64a (excluding gods); Σ *in* Ar. G66a (in Sybaritic fables), G67b (in Aesopic fables); Isid. G75 (in Libyan fables); cf. Σ *in* Aphth. (II 12 Walz) τοὺς ἐξ ἀλόγων καὶ λογικῶν μύθους.

[186] Arist. G5, Demetr. G10, Theon G20b (including personifications), Gell. G31, Hermog. G41 (indirectly), Philostr. G42, Sopat. Rh. G58.

[187] Yet other functions are apparent from some promythia and epimythia: Phaedr. 3.6.10 *deriden*, 4.18.2 *consolandi...gratia*, 5.4.7 *deterritus*; *fab. aes.* 7 (III) Hausrath, Synt. 10, 22, 28, 34, 61 ἐλέγχει; see also the Final Conclusion below, 2.2.

[188] Arist. G5; Quint. G18b; Theon G20c; Aphth. G54; Agath. G71; cf. Hes. 2T27c (Doxap.) ἔσθ' ὅτε καὶ οἱ ποιηταὶ πρὸς παραίνεσιν αὐτῷ [*sc.* τῷ μύθῳ] χρῶνται; Σ *in* Aphth. (II 12 Walz); Matth. Camar. *Epit.* (I 122 Walz).

[189] Cf. προτρέπω (1), παρακαλῶ (2), παραινῶ (3-5, 8-14, 16-22, 25-29, 31, 33-36, 40), ἀποτρέπω (7) in the titles of fables by Aphth.; Wolff, *Phil. Pract.* 315 (Harth 1978, 55, n. 42): *Ob vim hanc persuadendi veteres tanto in pretio habuere fabulas, adeoque iisdem usi sunt in rebus maxime arduis.*

[190] Luc. Tarrh. G21, Herenn. Ph. G27, Ps.-Diogenian. G28, Ptol. Ascal. G37; Σ *in* Hes. G65; Archil. 4T45 (Apostol.) αἶνός ἐστι λόγος...παρακλητικός.

(at least partly) explains the use of fables in politics[191].

b. Another function which is frequently[192] mentioned is a moral one (νουθετεῖν[193], παιδεύειν[194], ῥυθμίζειν, πλάττειν, τὸ ἀγαθόν, *monere*[195], *corrigere*[196], *mores*[197], *adhortatio in bonam frugem, calumnia malorum*).

c. This moral function is related to, and may be combined with[198], another, didactic (διδάσκειν[199]; *docere*[200], *instruere*[201], *discere*[202], *agnoscere*[203]) function, which fables may have also and which (or: the combi-

---

[191] See the exemplifications given by Arist. G5 and Isid. G75; cf. Liv. G11; Nicol. G64a, equating μυθεῖσθαι with λέγειν πολιτικῶς (see the next chapter, 1.3); Σ *in* Ar. G67b; *Praef. fab. Aes.* (*Aes.* T1): χρησίμην...ἐν ταῖς δημηγορίαις τὴν τῶν μύθων δήλωσιν; Demandt 1991.

[192] Phaedr. G13, Babr. G19c, D.Chr. G22 (implicitly), Hermog. G41, Nicol. G64c, Prisc. G70, Rom. G74c, Isid. G75; cf. Phot. *Ep.* 277 τὰ ἤθη τῶν ἀνθρώπων εἰς τὸ κόσμιον ἀπὸ τοῦ πεπατημένου μετερρύθμιζε [*sc.* Αἴσωπος]; Archil. 4T45 (Apostol.) ἐκ...κατορθωμάτων.

[193] Cf. ΝΟΥΘΕΤΕΙΝ in the title of Aphth. 17 (as well as ἐνουθέτει in its *incipit* (cf. S. 13F2.1156)).

[194] Cf. Ar. 17T38 (Eust.).

[195] Cf. the use of (derivatives from) *monere* in promythia and epimythia: Phaedr. 1.19.2, 1.26.2, 3.8.1, 3.17.13, 4.4.12; Gell. G31; Avian. 16.19, 30.17, 41.17; anon. Avian. *passim*; *apol Avian.* 16, 30, 40; Nov. Avian. Ast. 2.12; Nov. Avian. Par. 3.2; Nov. Avian. Vind. 5, 22; Alex. Neq. *Nov. Aes.* 11, 14, 20, 25, 27, 29-30, 34, 40, 42; Rom. 43, 53, 77 (*bis*) Thiele (*rec. gall.*); Luther 6-9, 11, 15; Guar. *Aes. fab.* 13, 17, 20; Barb. *Aes. fab.* 3, 17, 19, 32-33; Ar. 17T63b (Erasm.); Ad. Cab. 10 (*ammonitio* "epimythium").

[196] Cf. *emendare* in the promythium of Phaedr. 2.5(.5).

[197] Cf. [*fabule...morales*] in Rom. Bern. (*in titulo*) and Johannes de Schepeya (*expl.*; IV 450 Hervieux); *Nov. Avian. Prol.*9 (III 371 Hervieux), the use of *moralitas* (Rom. Angl. Cunct., Rom. Nilant. *fab. rhythm.*, anon. Avian.) and *moralisationes* (*super Aviani fabulis*; Hervieux III 480-501) for epimythia.

[198] Philostr. G42-43; Rom. G74b; Plan. *Prooem. Vit. Aesop.* (*Aes.* T2); Wolff, *Phil. Pract.* 302: *Fabula enim veritatis cujusdam moralis docendae gratia invenitur* (Harth 1978, 52).

[199] Cf. the epimythia of *fab. aes.* 3 (I), 43 (I), 80, 114 (Ib), 151, 183 (II), 252 (I), 257, 265 Hausrath.

[200] Cf. the use of (derivatives from) *docere* and *praecipere* in prologues, promythia and epimythia: (e.g.) Phaedr. 2.4.26; Ps.-Dos., p. 97 Goetz (*praecipit* rendered by παραγγέλλῃ); Avian. 27.9; anon. Avian. 1-2, 4, 33, [38]; *apol. Avian.* 4, 27; Nov. Avian. Ast. 1.2, 2.14; Nov. Avian. Vind. 7; Alex. Neq. *Nov. Aes.* 1, 5, 12, 17, 31, *Nov. Avian.* 3-4; Ant.-Avian. 3-4; *rhythm. mor. passim*; Rom. 36, 46, 75, 88 Thiele (*rec. gall.*); *Rom. Nilant. fab. metr. Prol.* (II 653-654 Hervieux); Guar. *Aes. fab.* 1-2, 6, 8, 12, 14-15; Barb. *Aes. fab.* 2, 8-9, 16, 24, 27, 29-30; D. 40T13 (Melanchthon (*bis*), calling fable *hoc docendi genere* (Hom. 1T6)); Conr. Hirs. *Dial. super Avian.*

[201] Cf. its use in promythia and epimythia: Rom. 72, 78 Thiele; Rom. Mon. 36; Cyrill. *Spec. Sap. Expl.* (p. 121 Grässe): *ad instructionem vitae humanae*; Barb. *Aes. fab.* 15.

[202] Cf. the occurrence of this verb in promythia and epimythia: Nov. Avian. Ast. 7; Nov. Avian. Vind. 34; Alex. Neq. *Nov. Aes.* 10, 16, 19, 28, 32, 41, *Nov. Avian.* 2; Ant.-Avian. 1; *rhythm. mor.* 31.3.

[203] Cf. *rhythm. mor.* 30.2 *noscere*.

nation of which) is sometimes[204] more vaguely called its "usefulness" (ὠφελής). This didactic function (partly)[205] explains the traditional use[206] of fables as school texts[207], more particularly as teaching material in the *progymnasmata*[208], as well as the fact that fables are more than once (but not exclusively[209]) said to be told to children[210].

d. Another function of the genre, which is mentioned by[211], or apparent from[212], several testimonies, is to amuse (notably judges, symposiasts[213], a weary audience). This comical function (ψυχαγωγία[214]; *ob-/delectare*) might seem something completely different from

---

[204] *Vit. Aesop.* G40a; Them. G57, anon. *in* Pl. 74; cf. *Pa.Bodl. in titulo* (Cod. Marcianus; p. 1 Knoell *in app. crit.*) πάνυ ὠφέλιμα; J. Racend. *Syn. Rhet.* 3 (III 525 Walz) χρήσιμα; Phot. *Ep.* 143; Guar. *Aes. fab.* 9 *utilitatem*; Melanchthon *De utilitate fabularum* (col. 116-120 Bretschneider).

[205] Fisher (1987, 201-202) concludes that "the [Latin] fables' history has not revealed any evidence to support the claim that morality was the primary rationale for their place in the curriculum", but that "in all periods the fables were [*sc.* primarily] used for reading practice"; cf. Galli 1978, 8 for the Greek.

[206] Misuse in Schmalzriedt's view (1988, 184), but see Provenzo 1976 and Fisher 1987.

[207] See, e.g., Zalateo, G., "Papiri scolastici", *Aegyptus* 41, 1961, 185 n. 175, 186 n. 185, 187 n. 195, 191 n. 254, 202 n. 357 (*Tab. Ass.*, for which see Hesseling, D.C., "On Waxen Tablets with Fables of Babrius", *JHS* 13, 1892/1893, 293-314; Crusius, O., "Fabeln des Babrius auf Wachstafeln aus Palmyra", *Philologus* 53 (*n.s.* 7), 1894, 228-252; id., "Ad Babrii fabulas Palmyrenas", ib. 428; Leeuwen, J. van, "De codicillis nuper bibliothecae Lugduno-Batavae donatis", *Mnemosyne n.s.* 22, 1894, 223-230), 359; Weil, H., "Plusieurs fables de Babrios sur tablettes de cire", *JS* 1894, 142-152); Daris, S., "Papiri letterari dell'Università Cattolica di Milano", *Aegyptus* 52, 1972, 91-96; Van Dijk 1997, 100. For *PBour.* 1, containing Babr. G19a, see above, n. 46.

[208] Quint. G18a, Theon G20a-c, Suet. G30, Hermog. G41, Aphth. G54, Sopat. Rh. G58, Syn. G61, Nicol. G64a, Prisc. G70; cf. Ar. G2, Aus. G52.

[209] See Jul. G50; cf. *Rom. Angl. Prol.* (II 564 Hervieux): *parvuli...et...adulti*; Knauth 1988b, 78; Hasubek 1996, col. 187; Jans, E., *et al.*, *Pallas* 3, Leeuwarden: Eisma 1996, 42-45.

[210] Plu. G24a, Philostr. G42-43, anon. *in* Pl. G73; cf. Eust. Antioch. G46, Aus. G52. Cf. the use of the vocative παῖ in epimythia (Babr. 18.15, 72.23 (as well as in G19b.1; cf. Kuppers 1990, 29-30); Lib. *Prog.* 2), the occurrence of ΝΕΟΥΣ and ΝΕΟΤΗΤΙ in the titles of fables (Aphth. 1-2; 22), and παιδοτριβῶν in Plan. *Prooem. Vit. Aesop.* (*Aes.* T2). Demandt (1991, 401), however, asserts that "im Altertum Fabeln sich an Erwachsene richteten".

[211] Ar. G1a and c, Auct. ad Her. G7, Cic. G8-9, Quint. G18c, Mar. Victor. G47, Hsch. G69a; cf. Rinuc. *Prooem./Argum. Vit. Aesop.* (Lockwood 1913, 70-71).

[212] Phaedr. G12, Sen. G17, Luc. G32, Him. G55; cf. J. *AJ* 5.239 οὐ γέλωτος ἕνεκα (!); D.Chr. 32.67 ἔπαιζεν; Ar. 17T63b (Erasm.) *lepidam fabulam*; D. 40T13 (Erasm.) rem...lepidam, atque auditu jucundam; 40T14 (Melanchthon) *lepido/festivo apologo*; Lorichius 1542, 20: *lepidissimo*.

[213] Cf. Hermog. G41, Prisc. G70.

[214] Cf. ΨΥΧΑΓΩΓΩΝ in the title of Aphth. 23 (as well as ψυχαγωγοῦσι in its epimythium).

the moral-didactic functions mentioned above, but is often combined with one or the other (and/or with the persuasive function)[215]. Even more, this felicitous blend of *utile dulci* is said to be the genre's strong point.[216]

e. Yet another function is the use of fables as a veiled expression of opinion for those ((former) slaves like Phaedrus and Aesop) who dare not speak outright, which is twice[217] mentioned (in combination with the didactic, comical, and hortatory functions).

f. A more neutral, illustrative (ὑπογραφή, παράστασις) function, which is related to the didactic function, is also twice (D.Chr. G23, Sopat. Rh. G52) mentioned,[218] in combination with the moral and with the persuasive function.

g. The testimonies do not state that fables can have an aetiological function, but some (Demetr. G10; Philostr. G42; cf. Arist. G5, Alex. Aphr. G44) exemplify the genre by aetiologies.

3. Formal considerations. One testimony (Σ *in* Ar. G67a) reports that οὕτω(ς) is a typical fable *incipit*. Several testimonies regard fable and epimythium as a unity, the epimythium expressing the message of the fable; some of these suggest variation between promythia and epimythia, but others deem the use of promythia inconsequent.[219]

---

[215] Moral: Phaedr. G12, *PMich.* G45, Macr. G60 (cf. *Gualt. Angl. Prol.*11 (cf. Bisanti, A., "L'*ornatus* in funzione didascalica nel prologo di Gualtiero Anglico", *Sandalion* 12-13, 1989-1990, 139-163), Nicol. Perg. *Dial. creat. Praef.* (p. 127 Grasse), *Access. Avian.* (p. 306 Huygens), *Praef. fab. Aes.* (*Aes.* T1a)). Didactic: Aus. G52, Avian. G59 (cf. Greg. Naz. *Poem. mor.* 2.12.699-700). Both: Rom. G74a (cf. *Praef. fab. Aes.* (*Aes.* T1(ab), *Rom. Angl. Prol.* (II 564 Hervieux), Dati *Praef.*), Melanchthon *Utl. fab.* Useful: Phaedr. G15b (cf. Plu. G24a; Laur. Vall. *Fac. mor. prol.* (Ruelle 1986, 39), Rinuc. *Anaceph. Vit. Aesop.* (Lockwood 1913, 72). Persuasive (cf. Ps. *Orat.* 25.137; Erasm. *Cop.* 2 (p. 254 Knott)); plus moral: Gell. G31, Nicol. G64a, cf. Agath. G71. Cf. Hassauer (above, Chapter I, 2.11).

[216] Phot. *Ep.* 277, however, preferring the Epistles of St. Paul, criticizes this combination.

[217] Phaedr. G14, Jul G45; cf. Aug. G63 (*intimare*). Cf. Archil. 4F2a.2 ἀχνυμένη σκυτάλη; *Vit. Aesop.* 93G: ὁ δὲ Αἴσωπος ἔφη "γνώμην μὲν οὐ δώσω, λόγῳ δέ τινι λέξω ὑμῖν..."; ibid. W; Gell. G31 *innuit*; Procop. *Pers.* 1.3.13 τύχην μὲν τὴν παροῦσαν ὡς ἥκιστα ἀπεκάλυψεν, ἀρξάμενος δὲ μυθοποιίας...; Hes. 2T30c (Eust.) τὴν τοῦ αἴνου ἀξίωσιν κεκρύφθαι δεῖ καὶ μὴ ἐκφωνεῖσθαι πρὸς λογίους μέντοι ἀκροατάς; the use of *innuit* in the epimythia of Laur. Vall. *Fac. mor.* (Ruelle 1986, *passim*) and Erasm. *Adag.* 1.4.18 (p. 188E); Van Dijk (1994e, 378; 1995b, 138).

[218] Cf. the use of (derivatives from) *monstrare*, *explicare*, and *indicare* in prologues and epimythia: *Rom. Nilant. fab. rhythm. Prol.* (II 714 Hervieux); Guar. *Aes. fab.* 5, 19, 22-23, 25; Barb. *Aes. fab.* 1, 6-7, 10-12, 18, 21-22, 28, 31-32.

[219] Theon G20c, Hermog. G41, Philostr. G42, Aphth. G54, Nicol. G64a, Prisc. G70, Olymp. G72, anon. *in* Pl. G73; cf. *Praef. fab. Aes.* (*Aes.* T1) ἐν τοῖς ἐπιμυθίοις ἐδήλωσε [*sc.* Αἴσωπος]. Variation: Theon, Hermog., Aphth.; cf. Jo. Geom. *ap.*

These statements—as well as certain stylistic prescriptions (concerning simplicity and clarity or sweetness (γλυκύτης))[220]—seem to be based upon the emphasis laid on fable *collections*, where promythia and epimythia indicate to which end a particular fable can be used. On the other hand, the many exemplifications from Archaic, Classical, and Hellenistic Greek literature[221] (as well as from Latin literature and the Holy Writ)[222] show that ancient theoreticians were well aware that fables may occur outside collections, too. Even more, connecting a fable with a context was taught at school (Theon G20c; cf. Demetr. G10).

4. The appreciation of fable. The genre is praised by several testimonies[223], but described in negative terms by several others[224], whereas criticism forces two fabulists to go on the defensive (Phaedr. G12, G14; Plu. G25c: Aesop). As a matter of fact, both criticizing and defending fables was taught at school (Theon G20c). The genre's popularity[225] is apparent from the statue(s)[226] and picture[227] allegedly

---

Doxap. *in* Aphth., II 174 Walz; Erasm. *Cop.* 2 (p. 256 Knott) *sermonis...varietas*. No promythia: Nicol., Prisc.

[220] Quint. G18a, Theon G20c, Hermog. G41, Nicol. G64a, Prisc. G70; cf. Jo. Geom. *ap.* Doxap. *Comm. in* Aphth., II 176-177 Walz, for which see Luzzatto 1983, 176-177.

[221] (I. Hom.), Hes. 2F1, Archil. 4F1-2, Stesich. 7F2, Simon. 9F1, Timocr. 10F1-2, A. 12F1, Ar. 17F3-4, Call. 20F2, Hdt. 31F1, Philist. 33F1, Theopomp. Hist. 35F1, D. 40F1, (44. Alcmaeon Crot., 46. Socr.), X. 50F1, Phaedo 51F1ab, (54. Epicur.).

[222] See Quint. G18b, Gell. G31, Avian. G59, Aug. G63, Prisc. G70, Isid. G75.

[223] Demetr. G10, Babr. G19b, D.Chr. G23, Plu. G25b and d, Gell. G31, Max. Tyr. G35, Philostr. G42-43 (Apollonius), Jul. G50, Aus. G53, Him. G55-56, Syn. G61 (rhetoricians), Agath. G71, Olymp. G72; Rom. G74b; cf. Plin. *NH* 36.82 (*Aes.* T15) *Aesopi fabellarum philosophi*; Lib. *Ep.* 764 τὸν βέλτιστον Αἴσωπον; Σ *in* Ar. (G66a) τὸν λογοποιὸν Αἴσωπον διὰ σπουδῆς εἶχον; *Aes.* T4-5; Luzzatto 1988, 438; Phaedr. 2.9.1, Rom. *Epil.* [*ingenium Aesopi*]; *Rom. Angl. Prol.* (II 564 Hervieux) *unum...memoria dignum*; Const. Porphyr. *Them.* 1.4 (*Aes.* T4) ὀνομαστότατος; Arist. 57T4 (Bocc.) *Esopus...uenerabilis*; Luther 11 *sapiens* [= *Esopus*].

[224] Ar. G1b, Liv. G11, Quint. G18b, Tat. G38, Philostr. G42 (Menippus), Alex. Aphr. G44, Eust. Antioch. G46, Syn. G61, anon. *in* Pl. G73. Cf. Chor. *Dial.* 14.3 εἰ δὲ μὴ ἐδεδοίκειν ἐγὼ τοὺς ἐπὶ τῇ μυθολογίᾳ με σκώψοντας... ...εὖ οἶδα ὅτι μοι τὸν μῦθον ἀρχόμενον διακόψετε.

[225] *Vit. Aesop.* G40c, cf. b, Iul. Vict. G49; cf. Pl. G2, Quint. G18b *nota*, Mar. Vict. G47, Σ *in* Ar. G67b, Ar. 17T63a (Erasm.) *antiquitus Æsopi fabellas etiam vulgus idiotarum tenebat.* Cf. Schmalzriedt 1988, 184 (overemphasizing this aspect). For Alexis' *Aesop*, see the Appendix below.

[226] Tat. G38, Agath. G71; Phaedr. 2.9.1-2 *Aesopi ingenio statuam posuere Attici,* | *servumque collocarunt aeterna in basi*; Rom. *Epil: de statua sua Aesopus ad cives.*

[227] Philostr. G43; cf. Phaedr. 4.6.2 *historia, quot sunt, in tabernis pingitur.* Two modern examples (by Velázquez and Ribera) are to be admired in the Prado in Madrid (see

representing Aesop, as well as from the oral[228] tradition of fables (notably at symposiums, in courts, and in politics (see above); this is not to say that fables did not circulate in writing as well[229]).

Finally, some testimonies comment upon the relationship between fable and other (sub)genres or forms of imagery.

1. proverb. The close relationship between fable and proverb is explicitly stated by Ps.-Diogenian. G28 (cf. anon. *Περὶ αἴνου* G39), and apparent from Demetr. G10 (cf. the definition by Σ *in* Hes. G65). Several testimonies[230] observe the reciprocity of the two genres.

2. comparison. Fables are said to be related to comparisons (cf. Demetr. G10) in that both are fictitious (Arist. G5) and may have a moral function (D.Chr. G22).

3. myth. Fable and myth are compared by Olymp. G72, but contrasted by several other testimonies (cf. Jul. G51) regarding their originality and effect (Philostr. G42), (relative) fictitiousness (Philostr.; Macr. G60; Nicol. G64b), characters (Nicol. G64a), usefulness (anon. *in* Pl. G73), and function (Isid. G75).

4. parable. Aug. G63 classes fable and parable in the same fictitious genre.

5. fairy tale. Fables are said to be related to fairy tales in that they have the same (Aus. G52), or a similar, educational (Quint. G18a) or entertaining (D.Chr. G23) function. Jul. G50, however, opposes the audience and functions of the two genres.

Snell, B., "Asop und Menipp als Hofnarren", *ICS* 6.2, 1981, 317; Berger, J., "A Story for Aesop", *Granta* 21, 1987, 11-19).

[228] Cf. Archil. 4F1a.1 ἀνθρώπων; West 1984, 113; Nic. 3F1.343 ἐν αἰζηοῖσι φορεῖται.

[229] See Ar. G2 (?), Pl. G3 (?), Theon G20c, Aus. G52, Aphth. G54, and (obviously) the fable collections (Phaedr. G12-16, Babr. G19a-c, Avian. G59, Rom. G74ab) and *Vit. Aesop.* G40a-c. Cf. Menedemum Eretr. 53T1 (D.L.) ἀνεγνωκέναι; Phaedr. G14.29 *stilo*; id. 4.26.3 *tradam memoriae*; id. *App.* 2 *tit.*: *legunt libellum*; id. 1.1.14; Jul. *Ep.* 82, 444b ἐκ τοῦ βιβλίου; Nov. Avian. Vind. 2 *legimus*; Rom. 53 Thiele (*rec. gall.*) *scripta(m)*; Rom. *Epil.*: *edidi*; *Rom. Angl. Prol.* (II 564 Hervieux); *Rom. Nilant. fab. metr. Prol.* (II 653-654 Hervieux) *cartis*; *Praef. fab. Aes.* (*Aes.* T1) βιβλιοθήκης; Tz. *H.* 4.937, 953 (11), 7.77 (105), 9.941 (297) [γράφω]; Hes. 2T27ab (Doxap.) βιβλίῳ, 2T45 (Melanchthon) *calamus*.

[230] Proverb < f.: Quint. G18b; f. < proverb: Luc. Tarrh. G21, Herenn. Ph. G27, Ptol. Ascal. G37; cf. Erasm. *Adag.* 4.1.94 (p. 990B), referring to Fabius: *brevis apologus...paræmiæ genus est.*

ANCIENT TERMINOLOGY

προσαγορεύουσι δὲ αὐτοὺς [*sc.* τοὺς μύθους] τῶν μὲν παλαιῶν οἱ ποιηταὶ μᾶλλον αἴνους, οἱ δὲ μύθους· πλεονάζουσι δὲ μάλιστα οἱ καταλογάδην συγγεγραφότες τὸ λόγους ἀλλὰ μὴ μύθους καλεῖν, ὅθεν λέγουσι καὶ τὸν Αἴσωπον λογοποιόν. (Theon, G20c)

ὁ μὲν αἶνος λόγος ἐστὶ μυθικός (Luc. Tarrh. (G21) *ap.* Archil. 4T35 (Eust.))

καὶ ὁ μῦθος καὶ ὁ αἶνος λόγος λέγεται (Theo Sm. G29)

Αἴσωπος ὁ μυθοποιὸς ἐρωτηθεὶς τί ἐστιν ἰσχυρότατον ⟨τῶν⟩ ἐν ἀνθρώποις εἶπεν· '⟨ὁ⟩ λόγος.' (Nicol. G64c)

This chapter examines the ancient Greek and Latin terminology of the fable.[1] First, the nouns meaning "fable" (or, to put it more cautiously: frequently[2] referring to fables) are discussed—in Greek: αἶνος, λόγος, μῦθος[3]; in Latin: *apologus*, *fabula*, *fabella*, including their derivatives—then words which may modify these nouns, either (formally different) connections with a fabulist's (particularly: Aesop's) name or various geographical adjuncts. The usages of each term will be compared in a conclusion.

1. *Greek Nouns*

1.1 *Αἶνος*[4]

The basic meaning of αἶνος is "spoken words with a hidden mean-

[1] Previous terminological studies (apart from Quint. G18b, Theon G20c, Nicol. G64a): Scaliger 1561, 138-139; De Gennaro-Ferrigni 1899, 1; Hausrath 1909, col. 1704-1706; Nøjgaard 1964, 122-129; Koep 1969, col. 129-131; Josifović 1974, col. 17-21; Adrados 1979a, 17-31; Costas Rodríguez 1985; Vater Solomon 1985, 117-118; Jedrkiewicz 1989, 290-294; Dalfen 1990, 56; Wissemann 1992; Van Dijk (1993d, 171-175; 1997, 102); Morocho Gayo 1994, 17-18.

[2] Sporadically, other nouns are used. These are also, if briefly, discussed.

[3] Not ἔπος, as stated by Wissemann 1992, 4 (perhaps misinterpreting Hofmann 1922). Scaliger (1561, 138) Latinizes *Ænos, Mythos.*

[4] (1) *Properispomenon*, not *oxytonon*; see Call. 20T14 (Eust.): πρὸς διάφορον δὲ σημασίαν βαρύνεται ὁ τοιοῦτος αἶνος, πρὸς διαστολὴν δηλονότι τοῦ καθ' εὐθεῖαν ὀξυνομένου αἰνοῦ, ἀφ' οὗ ἐπαινὸς Περσεφόνεια. (2) *nomen substantivum*, not *proprium* (but see below); cf. Phlp. *Dif. Ton.* sv: Αἶνος ὁ παροιμιώδης λόγος, καὶ πόλις τῆς

ing".[5] In this meaning αἶνος occurs twice in the *Iliad* (23.652, 795), once in the *Odyssey* (14.508[6]). Αἶνος "fable" comes under this heading.

Only seven fables are termed αἶνος in Greek literature[7]:

- Archaic Period: Hes. 2F1[8]; Archil. 4F1-2
- Hellenistic Period: Call. 20F2; D.S. 38F2
- Imperial Period: Stesich. 7T3 (Conon[9]); Call. 20T10 (*Dieg.*)
- Byzantine Period: Macar. 5.9

The fables from Hesiod and Archilochus are the oldest three fables extant in Greek literature. After the Archaic Period, αἶνος ("fable") seems to become obsolete.[10] In ten passages from the Imperial Period, however, αἶνος occurs as *terminus technicus* designating "fable" as a genre:

Quint. G18b, Theon G20c, Luc. Tarrh. G21, Ps.-Diogenian. G28[11],

---

Χερρονήσου; Eust. lc: τετραχῶς παρὰ τοῖς παλαιοῖς ὁ αἶνος. ἔπαινος γάρ, φασί, γνώμη, παροιμία, καὶ πόλις, ἣν ῥαίκηλον ὁ Λυκόφρων καλεῖ.

[5] Cf. Boisacq, É., *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque étudiée dans ses rapports avec les autres langues indo-européennes*, Heidelberg: Winter; Paris: Klincksieck; 's-Gravenhage: Nijhoff 1916, sv: "parole significative" (cf. Pannwitz 1966-1967, 56; Corbato 1979, 47); Chantraine, P., *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque. Histoire des mots*, I, Paris: Klinksieck 1968, sv: "paroles", "récits chargés de sens"; Mette, H.J., "αἶνος", *LfgrE* I, 1979, col. 324: "(hintersinniger) *Ausspruch*"; Verdenius, W.J., "ΑΙΝΟΣ", *Mnemosyne s. IV*, 15, 1962, 389: "allusive tale"; Schadewaldt 1982, 42: "Sinngeschichte". Differently: Crusius 1893, col. 1029: "ursprunglich neutral"; Nøjgaard 1964, 123 (*contra* Hofmann *l.c.*) "récit fictif"; Adrados 1979a, 20: "dicho, relato"; Jedrkiewicz 1989, 292: "enunciato"; Hofmann 1922, 52: "dictum cuius sententia e comparatione quadam pendet"; Thiele 1908, 399: "in Spruchform gefaßte Lob"; Frisk, H., *Griechisches etymologisches Worterbuch*, I, Heidelberg: Winter 1960, sv: "Rede, Lobrede" (cf. Nagy 1979, 235).

[6] This is not a fable; see below, 1. Hom. In Od. 21.110 αἶνος means "praise". Cf. Apollon. *Lex.* sv.

[7] Puelma Piwonka's conjecture (1949, 210) in Call. *Iamb.* 1 (fr. 191 Pfeiffer).5 (αἶνον...αἰ]νεῖν) (for which see the Appendix below) and Burges' (1845, 454) in Babr. G19a.17 (αἶνον) are left aside.

[8] Contra: Isebaert 1988, 376.

[9] Crusius obviously did not know the passages from Diodorus and Conon when he wrote (1893, col. 1030): "Als Terminus technicus für 'Fabel'...kommt das Wort [αἶνος] in Prosa nicht vor".

[10] Thus Nøjgaard 1964, 123-124; cf. Scaliger 1561, 138. Jedrkiewicz (1983, 251), however, asserts that "Le favole sono indicate come αἶνοι (*Fedone* [Pl.], 60b)" (*quod non*). Quotations from Hes. 2F1, Archil. 4F1-2, and Call. 20F2 are not counted here.

[11] Contra Heimgartner 1940, 32, who considers αἶνος "unzweideutig als eine Sprichwortbezeichnung".

Theo Sm. G29, (Ps.-?)Ptol. Ascal. G37, anon. *Περὶ αἴνου* G39, Jul. G50, Nicol. G64a, Σ *in* Hes. G65.

Theon derives αἶνος from παραίνεσις, "since[12] a fable contains some exhortation" (likewise Nicolaus; cf. Σ *in* Od. G68[13]). This explanation, though incorrect etymologically[14], is significant for the (persuasive) function of fables. Besides, in this connection, it is noteworthy that Αἶνος is the name of Aesop's adopted son (*Vit. Aesop.* 103-110W *passim*).[15]

There are two[16] derivatives from αἶνος "fable":

- αἴνιγμα: "fable"[17] (S.E. *M.* 8.103; Max. Tyr. 32.2; cf. Ar. 17T62 (Erasm.))
- αἰνίσσομαι (-ττ-)[18]: "to tell a fable" (S. 13T2a (Σ); Call. 20T14 (Eust.))

These meanings are not recorded in LSJ (nor in the *Rev. Suppl.*).

Besides "fable", αἶνος can mean also[19] "proverb" (e.g. E. fr. 58 Nauck²; probably in Theoc. 14.43 (see the Appendix below)) and, as

---

[12] ὅτι. Nøjgaard (1964, 124) reads ὅτε and misinterprets the passage. Hes. 2T19 (*Hypoth.* Isoc.), conversely, derives παραίνεσις from αἶνος. For the derivation of αἶνος from ἰαίνω in the Byzantine Period (e.g. Hes. 2T35a (*EM*), 2T37 (Ps.-Zonar.), Call. 20T16 (Apostol.)), see Van Dijk 1993d, 172 with n. 7. Call. 20T14 (Eust.) reports yet another etymology: ἢ καὶ παρὰ τὸ αἰανόν. σκοτεινὸς γὰρ λόγος ὁ τοιοῦτος αἶνός ἐστι.

[13] Cf. Doxap. *Comm. in* Aphth. (II 143 Walz); Σ *in Aphth.* (II 570 Walz); Scaliger 1561, 138.

[14] Contra Nagy 1979, 239, n. 2; see Van Dijk 1993d, 172.

[15] Cf. Nagy 1979, 239, n. 2; Compton 1990, 335. The toponym Αἶνος in Call. *Iamb.* 7 (fr. 197 Pfeiffer), however, is something different (see the Appendix below, as well as above, n. 4).

[16] For Puelma Piwonka's conjecture (1949, 210) αἰ]νεῖν in Call. *Iamb.* 1 (fr. 191 Pfeiffer).5, see above, n. 7. For Meuli's interpretation of πολύαινος as "fabelreich", see below, 1. Hom., n. 11.

[17] It may be noted that Aesop is called αἴνιγμα in *Vit. Aesop.* 98G; cf. Compton 1990, 347.

[18] One might compare several occurrences of this verb in connection with fables (S. 13F2.1158; Ar. *Pax* 46 (Rosen 1984, 391-392); Gal. *Simp. med. temp.* 11.37 (12.360-361 Kühn), Max. Tyr. (G34; cf. Soury, G., *Aperçus de Philosophie religieuse chez Maxime de Tyr, Platonicien éclectique*, Paris: Les Belles Lettres 1942, 16-17, on 5.1 (*bis*)), Him. (G56), Ath. 13.604F (παραινίττομαι): "to hint at", Hes. 2T14 (Eust.)).

[19] According to Adrados (1989, 63), αἶνος may designate myths and anecdotes, too.

Theon (G20c; cf. Σ *in* Od. G68) already recognized, "riddle (*enigma*)"[20] (e.g. Panarces, fr. (a) West).

1.2 *Λόγος*

Λόγος, a verbal noun of λέγω, occurs only twice in Homer (in plural), where it means "talk"[21] (Il. 15.393, Od. 1.56). Subsequently, however, it expands enormously and soon occupies a vast semantic field (see e.g. Theo Sm. G29). One of its basic meanings is "narrative". This meaning is neutral in that λόγος can designate both fact and fiction. Thus, λόγος may, and frequently does, occur in combination with both ἀληθής and ψευδής (e.g. Pl. *R.* 2, 376e). Among the different kinds of narratives which λόγος can designate are: *myth* (Hes. *Op.* 106)[22], legend (Hdt. 2.62), a historical work (Hdt. 2.123), a speech (Aeschin. 3.57), one of the Gospels (*Act. Ap.* 1.1), and fable.

In Greek literature, the following fables are termed λόγος:

- Classical Period: Hdt. 31F1; Timocr. 10F1 (?); Ar. 17F2, 17A2-3; Arist. 39F1 (Stesich. 7T1)-2; X. 50F1; Antipho Soph. 45F1; cf. S. 13F2
- Hellenistic Period: D.S. 38F1
- Imperial Period: App. *BC* 1.101; D.Chr. 32.63, ib. 66[23], 72. 13-14; Ps.-Diogenian. G28; Luc. *Nigr.* 32; Plu. *Mor.* 112B, ib. 156A, ib. 158B, ib. 164B, ib. 831C, *Dem.* 23.5, *Phoc.* 9; S. 24T2/Hieronym. Rhod. 55T1 (Ath.); Aristid. *Or.* 28.136 (p. 184 Keil); Max. Tyr. 19.2; Ael. *VH* 10.5; Philostr. *VA* 5.16; Gal. *adv. Jul.* 8 (18.291 Kuhn); *Vit. Aesop.* 94GW, 97GW, 129GW, 131GW, 133G, 135-139[G]W, 140GW, 141W, cf. 100G[24]; Ach. Tat. 2.21; Hld. 2.33; Him. G50; Them. *in Ph.* 4.7; Stob. 4.8.24; Ar. 17T20b (Σ), 17T6 (Symm.); D. 40T5-6 (Σ *in* Luc.; Σ *in* Pl.).
- Fable collections: Dem. Phal. *ap.* D.L. 5.80; *PRyl.* 493 *passim*; Babr. 40.5; *fab. aes.* I *passim*; Synt. 1, 5, 36, 61

Besides, λόγος may denote "fable" as a genre:

---

[20] Cf. Call. 20T14 (Eust.): ὅτι δὲ καὶ γρίφῳ ἔοικεν ὁ τοιοῦτος αἶνος δῆλόν ἐστι. γριφεύεται γάρ πως ὁ αἰνισσόμενος; ibid.: σκοτεινὸς...λόγος ὁ τοιοῦτος αἶνός ἐστι καθὰ καὶ πᾶν αἴνιγμα.

[21] Cf. e.g. Wakker, G., sv, *LfgrE*, II, 1991, col. 1707: "(absichtsvolle) *Plaudereien*, (gezieltes) *Gerede*".

[22] See Wakker, G., "Die Ankundigung des Weltaltermythos (Hes. Op. 106-108)", *Glotta* 68, 1990, 86-90; the Appendix below.

[23] See Ferrante, D., *La semantica di* logos *in Dione Crisostomo alla luce del contrasto tra retorica e filosofia*, Napoli: Loffredo 1981, 54.

[24] See Van Dijk 1996a, 540.

Ar. G1c; Socr. 46T1 (Pl.); Arist.[25] G5; Chamael. G6; Sen. G17; Quint. G18b[26]; Babr. G19b.6[27]; Theon G20c; D. Chr. G23; Plu. G25d; Ps.-Diogenian. G28; Theo Sm. G29; Max. Tyr. G33-34; *Vit. Aes.* G40bc (G); Phryn. *PS*, p. 86 De Borries; Philostr. G42; Him. G55; Hsch. G69b, G69d.

Λόγος is the common designation for "fable" in the Classical Period. Thereafter, λόγος "fable" is gradually replaced by μῦθος (see next subsection). Λόγος only once[28] designates Byzantine fables. Theon (G20c) reports that especially prose-writers designate fables by λόγος, not by μῦθος. In fact, λόγος "fable" does not occur in poetry, except in Aristophanes (and perhaps Timocreon).

There are several derivatives from λόγος "fable" (in alphabetical order):

- διαμυθολογέω has been listed below, under μῦθος (1.3)
- ἐπιλέγω: Theon G20c (75.19 Spengel; cf. ib. 72.30 and 74.5) "to make up an ἐπίλογος"
- ἐπίλογος: Theon G20c (p. 75.28-31, 77.29-31 Spengel *sexies*); Jo. Sard. *in* Aphth. *Prog.* 2.11, p. 13.12 Rabe) "epimythium (statement expressed after a fable)"
- cf. εὑρεσίλογος[29]: *Vit. Aesop.* 33G (LSJ: "ingenious in argument, sophistical")
- cf. κακόλογος: *Vit. Aesop.* 126
- λογομυθοποιός[30]: *Vit. Aesop.* (G40a)W "fabulist"

[25] For λόγος "fable", *fabula* (*Gual.*) is a more felicitous Latin translation than *sermo* (*anon.*).

[26] In Mart. 3.20.5, neither Heraeus' λόγους (accepted by Weinreich, O., *Studien zu Martial*, Stuttgart: Kohlhammer 1928, 163) nor Thiele's *logos* (1911, 548) is *Gemeingut* (Fischer (1905, 20) and Travis (A.H., "*Improbi Iocos Phaedri*", *TAPhA* 71, 1940, 583) preferring *iocos*, De Lorenzi (1955, 194, n. 2) maintaining *locos*), the less so since "Phaedrus" might not be the fabulist (Friedländer, L., *M. Valerii Martialis Epigrammaton Libri*, Leipzig: Hirzel 1865, 292 (contra: Marchesi 1923, 80, n. 2); cf. Duff, J.W., *A Literary History of Rome in the Silver Age*, Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood P 1964[3] (repr. 1979), 120; Caratello 1964, 136; Currie 1984, 502).

[27] Boissonade 1844, 208: λόχῳ

[28] Phot. *Ep.* 221 (see Perry 1953, 313); id. *Bibl.* 241, 329a26 (Philostr. *VA* 5.16) and Ar. 17T44a (Tricl.) are not exceptions, since they, respectively, quote and comment upon ancient fables which are called λόγοι. For the use of the term in *Praef. fab. Aes.*, see below, n. 163.

[29] See my suggestion (1996a, 531 n. 57, 540): "able to find λόγοι".

[30] Simplified by Papathomopoulos 1989, 110 to λογοποιός, because "La version W est le seul texte où ces deux substantifs [λόγος and μῦθος] se trouvent pour ainsi dire amalgamés, ce qui rend cette exception suspecte:...". However, the compounds μυθολογία, μυθολόγημα and (δια)μυθολογέω militate against this "emendation". Perry (1962, 338) ingeniously interprets λογομυθοποιός as "maker of λόγοι and μῦθοι".

- λογοπλάθος: Phryn. *PS*, p. 86 De Borries: "fable-maker" (LSJ)
- λογοποιέω: Phot. *Ep.* 277 "to compose fables"
- λογοποιΐα: anon. *Vit. Babr.* "making of fables"; Eust. Antioch. G46 "fables" (pl.)
- λογοποιός: Hdt. 2.134[31], Theon G20c, Luc. *Icar.* 10, Max. Tyr. 15.5, D.L. 1.72, Him. G55, Apollon. *Lex.* sv ἄειδε, [Aphth.] *Praef. fab. Aes.* (*Aes.* T1; see below, n. 163) "fabulist" (LSJ: "writer[32] of fables")
- μυθολόγημα has been listed below, under μῦθος (1.3)
- ψευδολόγος: Tat. G38

One might add two Latin derivatives, which will be discussed below (2.1):

- *apologus*
- *apologatio*

LSJ does include the special meanings of λογοπλάθος and λογοποιός, but of the latter a more precise translation could be given. All other special meanings of the above (Greek) derivatives from λόγος "fable", however, are not recorded in LSJ[33] (nor in the *Rev. Suppl.*). The meaning of the roots of the first (εὑρεσίλογος, ψευδολόγος), second (λογοπλάθος, λογοποιέω, λογοποιΐα, λογοποιός) or third (λογομυθοποιός) constituent part of some of the above composite adjectives, nouns, or verbs, is relevant for the genre's fictitiousness.

Besides (as noted by Theo Sm. G29) "fable", λόγος can also mean "proverb" (e.g. Men. *Dysc.* 633; see the Appendix below).

1.3 *Μῦθος*[34]

The basic meaning of μῦθος is "word, speech". Μῦθος, unlike λόγος, frequently occurs in Homer, where it can also mean "story" (e.g. Od. 11.368). Μῦθος "fable" comes under this heading (A. 12F1). Besides a fable, μῦθος can also designate a legend, a myth, and the "plot of

[31] Nagy, G., in his response to Connor's remarks on his "Herodotus the *Logios*" (*Arethusa* 20, 1987, 175-184), 210, compares ib.143.1 (Hecataeus), and opposes ib. 135.1 μουσοποιός (Sappho).

[32] Cf. García Gual 1978b, 192.

[33] It might be noted that LSJ are unlikely to mean that λογίδιον in Ar. *V.* 64 refers to an *Aesopic "fable"* (sv); the same applies to the translations in *TGL* of these words by (derivatives of) "fabula".

[34] Hsch. μῦθαρ (LSJ *Rev. Suppl.*).

a comedy or tragedy" (LSJ; Arist. *Po.* 1449b5).[35] Theon (G20c) derives μῦθος "fable" from μυθέομαι as synonymous in antiquity with λέγειν. Nicolaus (G64a) specializes this etymological relationship by adding that fables constitute our earliest course in public speaking (λέγειν πολιτικῶς). In principle, μῦθος "story", like the post-epic λόγος, is neutral as to the fictitiousness or veracity of the story which it designates. Later, when λόγος eclipses μῦθος, a differentiating tendency can be observed, in that μῦθος is reserved for "fiction", λόγος for "truth".[36] When fables are termed both μῦθος and λόγος, μῦθος often has an obvious connotation of fictitiousness.[37] Luci(ll)us Tarrhaeus (*ap.* Archil. 4T35 (Eust.); cf. G21), significantly combining the three terms discussed hitherto, defines fable (αἶνος) as λόγος μυθικός, a "fictitious story". A comparison with the wording of Theon's definition of μῦθος as λόγος ψευδής is telling (G20c; Aphth. G54; Nicol. G64a). The rhetoricians reserve μῦθος for "fable" and λόγος for "pro- or epimythium" (Theon G20c[38]; Hermog. G41; cf. Nicol. G64a).

The following fables are termed μῦθος:

- Classical Period: A. 12F1; Ar. 17A2; Pl. 49F1, 49A1; Arist. 34F/A1, 57F1, 57A1
- Hellenistic Period: Nic. 3F1; Call.20F1; Demetr. 43A1 (Arist. 57T1), 43A2 (auct. inc. 58T1)
- Imperial Period: D.C. fr. 17.9-11; Eun. *Hist.* 87; Luc. *Bacch.* 8, *Herm.* 20, ib. 84; Plu. *Mor.* 16C, ib. 967A, *Agis* 2.3, *Cor.* 6.2; Max. Tyr. 15.5 *bis*, G33 (*bis*), G34, G35 (*ter*); Philostr. *Ep.* 37; Him. G56 *passim*; Lib. *Or.* 18.19, ib. 62.44; Them. *Or.* 16.208a, *Or.* 21.262b, *Or.* 22.278c-279a, *Or.* 24.306b, *Or.* 32.359bc; Jul. *Ep.* 8 (67).377D, *Ep.* 82 (59).444B, *Mis.* 366A; Ar. 17T27a (Σ); Arist. 57T2-3 (Alex. Aphr., Olymp.); Pl. 49T6ab (Herm.), 49T9a (Σ), 49T12a (Olymp.); anon. *Prol. Phil. Pl.* G73; Simp. *in Ph.* 6.9; Chor. *Dial.* 14.3; *Vit. Aesop.* 97GW; Ach. Tat. 2.20, ib. 21; Ps.-Callisth. *rec.* Γ 3.19, *rec.* E 40.2; Gal. *Aff. Dign.* 2.7, *Simp. med. temp.* 11.37 (12.360 Kühn), *In Hipp. prorrh.* 1.2.13; D.L. 2.42

[35] One might compare, e.g., the polysemy of English "fable" and Dutch "fabel".

[36] Pi. *O.* 1.29; Pl. *Ti.* 26e, *Grg.* 523a, *Prt.* 320c, 324d, *R.* 376e-377a, Socr. 46T1; cf. Smith 1985, 24-25.

[37] Ar. 17A2 (contra Herwerden, H. van, *Ἀριστοφάνους Εἰρήνη*, II, Leiden: Sijthoff 1897, 23); Socr. 46T1 (Pl.) (cf. Couturat 1896, 11; contra Carrière (*s.a.* 173, translating, respectively, "mythes" and "contes"), Romano (1964, 27: "Platone adopera...i due termini indifferentemente") and Adrados 1979a, 30 (cf. Stewart 1989, 261); cf. Theon G20c = Pl. 49T1; suspected by Butts (1987, 282) of being a scribal interpolation); Max. Tyr. G34 (Epicur. 54T1).

[38] Σ *in* Theon. *Prog.* (I 259 Walz): Λόγον ἐνταῦθα [p. 75 Spengel] τὸ ἐπιμύθιον λέγει....

- Ancient Christian Literature: Eus. *PE* 10.4.27
- Fable collections: Babr. 18.15, 22.13, 31.22, 34.14, 36.13, 38.8, 59.16, 96.5, 107.17, 116.15; *fab. aes.* II-III *passim*; Ps.-Dos. *passim*; Synt. 48, 56, 60; *Pa.Bodl.* 13, 18, 53, 60, 79, 85, 96, 107, 109, 116, 133, 143, 145 Chambry

Besides, μῦθος can indicate fable as a genre:[39]

Demetr. G10; Babr. G19a-c; Theon G20a-c; Theo Sm. G29; *Vit. Aesop.* G40bc; Phryn. *PS*, p. 86 De Borries; Hermog. G41, *Id.* 2.3 (Nicostr.); Philostr. G43; Jul. G50; Aphth. G54; Him. *Or.* 27.35, G56; Sopat. Rh. G58; Syn. G61; Nicol. G64a-c; Hsch. G69a and c; Agath. G71; Olymp. G72; anon. *Prol. Phil. Pl.* G73.

Μῦθος is the common designation for "fable" in the Imperial Period as well as in Byzantine[40] and Modern Greek[41].

There are many derivatives from μῦθος "fable":

- Δεκαμυθία: *Suda*, ν 404 Adler "fable collection in ten books"[42] (Jo. Sic. *Comm. in Hermog. Id.* 2.12 (VI 503 W): δεκάμυθος)
- διαμυθολογέω: Greg. Naz. *Ep.* 114.1; Theophyl. Simoc. *Ep.* 34 "to recount a fable"
- ἐκμυθόω: Philostr. G43 "make into a fable" (LSJ)
- ἐπιμύθιον: Luc. *Bacch.* 8; Aphth. G54; Nicol. G64a; Olymp. G72; anon. *Prol. Phil. Pl.* G73; Hes. 2T31a, Aristarch. 59T2 (Tz.); *Praef. fab. Aes.* (*Aes.* T1) "epimythium (statement expressed after a fable)" (LSJ: "moral"[43])
- μυθάριον: Plu. G24a[44], Ar. 17T23b (Σ), 17T46b (Tricl.), *Branc.* 4 (p. 142 Sbordone) "Dim. of μῦθος" (LSJ)
- μυθειολέγω [*sic*?]: *PMich.* G45.4-5 "to tell fables[45]"
- μύθευμα: Psel. *Orat.* 25.53-54 Littlewood "fable"
- μυθεύω: Eust. *Il.* Γ 17, Georg. Pach. *Prog.* (I 551-552 Walz) (passive), Plan. *Prooem. Vit. Aesop.* (*Aes.* T2) "to speak about in a fable"
- μυθιάζομαι: Babr. G19b "recount fables" (LSJ)

---

[39] The word's absence from Quintilian's brief discussion of fable terminology (G18b) is noteworthy.

[40] E.g. *Suda*, ε 490 Adler; Niceph. Basil. *Prog.* 1.2 (p. 73.34 Pignani); Hes. 2T31a (Tz.); [Aphth.] *Praef. fab. Aes.* (*Aes.* T1(ab)).

[41] Γεωργοπαπαδάκος *et alii* 1989-1990, sv μῦθος.

[42] Cf. Rutherford 1883, p. XL: "ten books of fables". Abstemius entitled his collections *Hecatomythia* (1495, 1499; see Galli 1978, 12).

[43] For this term, see the Conclusion of Chapter I above.

[44] Heirman, L.J.R., *Plutarchus "de audiendis poetis"*, diss. Leiden, 's-Gravenhage: Roeland 1972, 97: "'Kosename'".

[45] Winter (1922, 139) translates "the telling of myths".

- μυθίαμβος: Babr. *titulus*, G19b "(chol)iambic fable"[46] (LSJ: "the name given to a collection of Fables, such as those of Babr.")
- μυθικός[47]:
  - Theophyl. Simoc. *Ep.* 61, Hes. 2T31a (Tz.), Nicet. Chon. *Hist.* (p. 61 Van Dieten), Hes. 2T38b (Moschop.) "fable-, fable-like, fabulistic"
  - Eust. *Opusc.* 14.48, Nicet. Chon. *Hist.* (p. 491 Van Dieten: ὁ ~ κώνωψ) "from/in the fable"
  - *Suda* α 860, 2284, ε 3559, κ 442, 1863, λ 497, ν 163, π 2097, σ 1265, 1586, τ 105, οι 188 Adler (ἐν (τοῖς) Μυθικοῖς), J. Racend. *Syn. Rhet.* 3 (III 525 Walz) τὰ Μυθικά "books of fables"
- μυθικῶς: Phot. *Lex. s.v.* Ἐς κόρακας, *Suda* ε 3154 Adler, Hes. 2T31a (Tz.), Apostol. 7.96 (Arsen. 24.64) "in the form of a fable"
- μυθογράφος: Theon G20c *bis* (p. 77.20 Spengel, ib. 78.2); *Suda*, σ 1030 Adler (Βάβριος...ὁ ~); Tz. *H.* 7.77(105), 8.835 (230), 9.936 (297) "writer of fables"
- μυθολογέω: Arist. 57F1, 57T2 (Alex. Aphr.), Plu. *Ages.* 36.9 (passive), Greg. Naz. *Carm.* 1.2.28.232, with object or object clause (ὡς or *acc. cum inf.*) "to tell in a fable"; Him. G56, with acc. (τοιαῦτα) "to tell in fables"
- μυθολόγημα: Tat. G38 (negative connotation) "fable" (cf. Ar. 17T12, 17T54 (17T58a) (Ael., Apostol. (Arsen.)))
- μυθολογία:
  - Philostr. G42 *bis* "the art of fable-telling"
  - Nic. 3T1c (Σ) synonymous with μῦθος "fable"
  - Chor. *Dial.* 14.3 "fable-telling"[48]
- μυθολόγος: Philostr. G42 "fabulist" (*in malam partem*)[49]
- μυθοπλαστής: Ph. *Conf. Ling.* 6; New Greek[50] "coiner of fables"
- μυθοποιΐα: Procop. *Pers.* 1.3.13; Const. Porphyr. *Them.* 1.4 (*Aes.* T4) "making of fables" (LSJ)
- μυθοποιός: Theon G20c *bis*, Them. *Or.* 16.208a, G57, *Or.* 21.262b, *Or.* 32.359bc; Nicol. *Prog.* 3 (p. 22 Felten) (*Aes.* S11); Georg. Sync. 454 (p. 286 Mosshammer); Phot. *Ep.* 277 "fabulist" (LSJ)
- μυθουργία: Tz. *H.* 8.512 (205) "= μυθοποιΐα" (LSJ)
- παραμυθέομαι: ibid. "to express the pro-/epimythium" (?); cf. Plan. *in fab. aes.* 1 (Hausrath 1901, 95)
- παραμυθία: Plan. lc "pro-/epimythium"[51]; cf. New Greek παραμύθι ("fable") and παραμυθάκι (dim. of παραμύθι)[52]

---

[46] Provenzo (1976, 26), less accurately: "Fables-in-Verse".

[47] For Quint. G18b, see below, 5.5, n. 144.

[48] Cf. Neveletus 1610: *Mythologia Aesopica.*

[49] *TGL* adds μυθολογικός in Socr. 46T1 (Pl.): "*Qui valet comminiscendis fabulis, ut Aesopus*".

[50] Παραμύθια του Αισώπου με εικόνες, Athens: άγκυρα 1978 (repr. 1987), 3.

[51] Scaliger (1561, 139) coins περιμύθιον: "*sic...libet appellare* τοῦ μύθου *explicationem, quæ vel ante vel post solita est poni.*"

[52] Both occur in Παραμύθια του Αισώπου... (above, n. 50), *passim.*

- Πολυμυθία: *Suda*, ν 404 Adler "large fable collection"[53]
- προμύθιον; Aphth. G54; Nicol. G64a "moral prefixed to a fable" (LSJ; but rather "promythium (statement expressed before a fable)"[54]

LSJ includes the special meanings of ἐκμυθόω, ἐπιμύθιον, μυθάριον, μυθιάζομαι, μυθίαμβος, μυθοποιΐα, μυθοποιός, μυθουργία, προμύθιον, although ἐπιμύθιον, μυθίαμβος and προμύθιον could be translated more precisely. The special meanings of διαμυθολογέω, μύθευμα, μυθεύω, μυθικός, μυθικῶς, μυθογράφος, μυθολογέω, μυθολόγημα, μυθολογία, μυθολόγος, μυθοπλαστής, παραμυθέομαι, and παραμυθία, however, are not recorded in LSJ[55] (nor are those of παραμυθάκι and παραμύθι recorded in Γεωργοπαπαδάκος *et alii* 1989-1990), whereas the lemmas δεκαμυθία, μυθειολέγω [*si vera lectio*], and πολυμυθία are not included altogether in LSJ (nor in the *Rev. Suppl.*). As with λόγος, the meaning of the roots of the second part of some composite nouns (μυθοποιΐα, μυθοποιός, μυθουργία, μυθοπλαστής) testifies to the fictitious character of fables.

Besides "fable", μῦθος can also mean "proverb" (A. *Ch.* 314).

1.4 *Other Nouns*

Occasionally, some other Greek nouns refer to particular fables or to fables in general. These are the following (in alphabetical order):

1. ἄθυρμα[56]: Him. G56;
2. ἀπόφθεγμα: *Pa.Bodl.* (Cod. Marcianus) *in titulo* (p. 1 Knoell *in app. crit.*);
3. διήγημα: D. 40T4-6, 40T10b-12 (Zen., Σ Luc./Pl., *Suda*, Apostol. (Arsen.)); Greg. Nyss. *Prof. Chr.*, p. 131 Jaeger; Matth. Camar. *Epit.* (I 122 Walz); cf. Nicet. Chon. *Hist.* (p. 61 Van Dieten): μυθικὸν διήγημα[57];

---

[53] Cf. Von Christ, W.-Schmid, W.-Stahlin, O., *Geschichte der griechischen Litteratur*, II.2, Munchen: Beck 1924, 682, 817; Dreyer, O., "Nikostratos" (8), *DKP* 4, col. 128.

[54] See above, under ἐπιμύθιον. For Doderer's *hapax* "Anamythion", see above, Chapter I, 2.3.

[55] *TGL* does translate some of these words by (derivatives of) "fabula", but see above, n. 33.

[56] According to Perry (1962, 304) referring to Demetrius' fable collection (for which see the General Introduction above).

[57] Differently Theon, G20c; Nicol. G64a: τοὺς περὶ θεῶν μύθους τινὲς οὐ μύθους ἀλλὰ μυθικὰ ἐκάλεσαν διηγήματα, G64b; cf. Plu. (VII 143 Bernardakis) *ap.* Jul. *Or.* 7, 227A (contra Crusius 1896, col. 2658; Bieber 1906, 27-28; Gerhard 1909, 247, n.

- cf. [διήγησις]: Babr. 59.16 (μῦθος...ἐν διηγήσει)[58]; D. 40T8 (Phot.), Call. 20T16 (Apostol.);
- cf. [διηγέομαι]: Gal. *Protr.* 13, Nicol. G64a, Chor. *Dial.* 14.3, Ar. 17T27a (Σ), D. 40T9-10a (Phot., *Suda*);

4. ἱστορία[59]: Theoc. 21T2b (Σ); Σ *in* Luc. *Herm.* 20; Ar. 17T47a (Tricl.); see below, 2.4 *historia*;
5. παραβολή: Hes. 2T38b (Moschop.); see below, 2.4 *parabola*;
6. παράδειγμα: Niceph. Greg. *Byz. Hist.* 21.6.7;
   - cf. Synt. *in titulo*: ἐκ τῶν παραδειγματικῶν...λόγων;
7. παροιμία: Epiph. *Haer.* 41.3-4; Pl. 49T7 (Herm.) (but cf. 49T10 (Σ)), 49T11 (Σ); A. 12T11a, 12T17c (Σ, Tricl.));
   - cf. Eust. *Il.* Φ 595-607 κατὰ τὸν παροιμιώδη κύνα
8. πλάσμα: Greg. Naz. *Poem. Mor.* 2.12.699 (*PG* 37, 1217); Sopat. Rh. G58; Agath. G71.5; cf. Eust. Antioch. G46;
   - cf. the use of (composites of) πλάσσω (-ττω) in Demetr. G10, Theon G20c, Plu. G26, Phryn. *PS* (p. 86 De Borries), Max. Tyr. G33, Hermog. G41[60], Philostr. G43, Aphth. G54, Sopat. Rh. G58; Nicol. G64ab, Σ *in* Aphth. (II 12 Walz), Phot. *Ep.* 277, Tz. *H.* 8.512 (205), Ar. 17T38 (Eust.);
   - cf. πλάστης in Hes. 2T27ab (Doxap.)[61];
   - cf. πλάσις in Nicol. G64a;
   - cf. λογοπλάθος (see above, 1.2);
   - cf. μυθοπλαστής (see above, 1.3).

Although the occurrence of these nouns (when referring to fables) is too sporadic to regard it as the use of terminology, they are relevant to different aspects of the genre, viz. its comical function (ἄθυρμα), its narrative (διήγημα, ἱστορία) and metaphorical character (παραβολή; cf. παράδειγμα), its close relationship to proverbs (παροιμία; cf. ἀπόφθεγμα), and its fictitiousness (πλάσμα).

9; Hausrath, 1938, col. 1489). It might be noted also that in Ar. 17T6 (Symm.) διηγηματίου is apparently not synonymous with Αἰσωπείου λόγου (for which see the Appendix below, under Ar. *Av.* 439-442).

[58] Luzzatto-La Penna *ad loc.*: "i.e. διήγημα μυθικόν".

[59] Cf. Werner 1892, 1: "*in Aesopi historiolis colligendis*"; Jaeger *ad* Greg. Nyss. *Prof. Chr.* (p. 131). Differently Theon, G20c τὸ παρὰ τὴν πεπιστευμένην ἱστορίαν.

[60] Pp. 2 and 3 (but not p. 1) Rabe.

[61] Not in Agath. G71.

1.5 *Comparison*

The question may be raised whether or not the Greek terms discussed above refer to different types of fables or have different connotations (when applied to fables). We may distinguish instances in which two different terms refer to fables (1) in the same context and (2) in different contexts.

(1) It has been noted above that when both μῦθος and λόγος mean "fable" μῦθος often has a connotation of fictitiousness. Besides, λόγος may refer to fables in prose, μῦθος to fables in verse.[62] Elsewhere, however, μῦθος and λόγος seem to be used for "fable" without distinction (Philostr. G42; *Vit. Aesop.* 97GW; Ach. Tat. 2.21[63]; Him. G56; Arist. 39T1a and d (anon. *in Rh., passim*), glossing λόγος with μῦθος; *Praef. fab. Aes.* (see below, n. 163)). In one passage (Phryn. *PS*, p. 86 De Borries) it is unclear whether or not these two terms are synonymous.

(2) Aristotle, Galen, and *scholia Platonica* seem to differentiate between μῦθος and λόγος, by using μῦθος for aetiological fables[64] and λόγος for the standard type[65]. Callimachus (20F1-2) does the same but replaces λόγος with αἶνος. Other authors, however, may just vary without distinction between these terms. Thus, in two dialogues of Lucian the fable of Momus is termed μῦθος (*Bacch.* 8, *Herm.* 20), but in another dialogue λόγος (*Nigr.* 32). Diodorus Siculus is the only author who, apparently without distinction, terms one fable αἶνος (38F2), another one λόγος (38F1; cf. Call. 20T11 (Choer.), where αἶνον is glossed with λόγον). Again other authors designate different types of fables by one term. Plato's use of μῦθος is an example (49A1 (animal fable), 49F1 (aetiological fable)).

2. *Latin Nouns*

2.1 Apologus

The Greek ἀπόλογος, an infrequent *compositum* of λόγος, means

[62] Babr. G19b; Luzzatto 1975, 67. Elsewhere, however, Babrius (G19a.16) refers to fables in prose (τῆς ἐλευθέρης μούσης; Christoffersson 1901, 10) by μῦθος.

[63] See Van Dijk 1995b, 139 (*Vit. Aesop.*); 1996a, 527 (Ach. Tat.).

[64] Arist. 57F1, 57A1; Gal. *Aff. Dign.* 2.7, *in Hipp. prorrh.* 1.2.13, *Simp. med. temp.* 11.37 (12.360-361 Kuhn); Pl. 49T9a (Σ).

[65] Arist. G5 (39F1-2); Gal. *adv. Jul.* 8; Pl. 49T9d (Σ).

"story".[66] The oldest occurrence of its Latin transcription[67] *apologus* preserves this general meaning.[68] In Latin[69], *apologus* more frequently designates a special type of story, i.e. "fable"[70].

In Latin literature, only two fables are termed *apologus*:

- Imperial Period: Gell. G31 *bis*; Apu. *De deo Socr. prol.* 4

Besides, however, various theoretical passages refer by *apologus* to "fable" as a genre:

- Auct. ad Her. G7, Cic. G8-9, Quint. G18c, Suet. G30, Gell. G31.1, Mar. Vict. G47, Fortun. G48, Iul. Vict. G49, Aus. G52, Mart. Cap. G62

Apologus cannot be equated with "animal fable"[71], since in Ennius' fable (*ap.* Gell. G31) human beings do occur as characters.

There is only one derivative from *apologus*[72] "fable":

apologatio: Quint. G18b "fable". Quintilian states that this term has not been widely accepted; in fact, it is a *hapax legomenon.*[73]

---

[66] It serves to indicate Odysseus' narration of his adventures at Alcinous' court: Od. 9-12 (*in titulo*); Pl. *R.* 614B, Arist. *Rh.* 1417a14; Crusius 1895b, col. 167-168; Hofmann 1922, 117; Adrados 1979a, 19.

[67] Cyrill. *Spec. Sap. Expl.* (p. 121 Grasse) etymologizes differently: *Et dicitur* [sc. *apologus*] *ab apos quod est longum et logos quod est sermo dubius vel fictus quasi sermo longe a veritate. Vel dicitur ab a, quod est sine, et pos, quod est pes, et logos, quod est sermo, quasi sermo sine pede, id est sine fundamento. Vel dicitur a pos, quod est sub, et logos..., quasi sub vero sermone diversus intellectus. Vel dicitur a pos, quod est juxta, et logos..., inde apologus quasi juxta sermonem.*

[68] Plaut. *St.* 538, 541, 544; Lewis, C.T -Short, C., *A Latin Dictionary*, Oxford: Clarendon P 1879 (repr. 1945), sv; Crusius 1894b; id. 1895b, col. 169: "anekdotenhafte Erzahlung"; Lehnert, "apologus", *TLL* 2, Leipzig: Teubner 1900-1906, col. 249: "*narratiunculae fictivae*".

[69] Not in Greek (contra Wunsche 1905, 2; Von Christ-Schmid-Stahlin 1912, I 189; Bolte-Polívka 1912-1932, IV 120; Sironić 1951; Josifović 1961; Nuchelmans 1976; Grubmuller 1977, 9), Giordano (1990, 185). Shell (1992, 85, n. 2) confuses *apologia* and *apologos.*

[70] Not *per se* "animal fable" (contra Kaster 1995, 281; cf. Pankau, J.G., "Apolog", in: Ueding 1992, col. 807).

[71] Contra Crusius 1895b, col. 170; Kaster 1995, 281.

[72] Jedrkiewicz (1989, 290) suggests that it is the other way round.

[73] Jedrkiewicz's assertion (ibid.) that *apologatio* is the *terminus technicus* "delle scuole retoriche" is a speculative generalization.

Apologus "fable" also occurs in Medieval and Neo-Latin literature.[74] The term has been adopted by various modern languages.[75]

2.2 Fabula[76]

Fabula is, as Isidore (G75) reports, a derivative from *fari* (cf. Greek φημί). It means "(subject of common) talk, narrative".[77] *Fabula* "narrative" can be used either in a wider, neutral, sense, or in a stricter sense, with a connotation of fictitiousness, as Macrobius (G60) and Isidore notice. It can designate various kinds of narratives: myths (e.g. Suet. G30 (where *apologus* means "fable")), dramas (e.g. Phaedr. 4.7.22 (see next subsection)), and fables[78].

In Latin literature, the following fables are termed *fabula*:

- Imperial Period: auct. inc. *Vir. ill.* 18.5; Quint. G18b; Gell. G31 *bis*; Apu. *De deo Socr. prol.* 4; Flor. *Epit.* 1.17; Iust. 43.4.4; Serv. *in Georg.* 1.378; Pseudacr. *in* Hor. *S.* 2.3.299, ib. 2.5.56, *Ep.* 2.3(*AP*).437; Porph. *in* Hor. *S.* 2.5.56; D. 40T7 (Isid.)
- Ancient Christian: Greg. Tur. *HF* 4.9; Hier. *Ep.* 29.7, ib. 79.3
- Fable collections: Phaedr.[79] 1.1.14, 1.10.3, 2.8.27, 3.6.10, 3.13.16, 4.4.12; Ps.-Dos. *passim*; Rom. *passim*.

Besides, *fabula* more than once refers to "fable" as a genre:

Phaedr. G12, 2.9.13, G14, G15a.10; Fortun. G48; Iul. Vict. G49; Aus. G52; Avian. G59; Macr. G60; Aug. G63; Prisc. G70; Rom. (*rec. gall.*) G74a-c; Isid. G76

[74] Medieval Latin: e.g. Jo. Sares. *Pol.* 6.24, 625b. Neo-Latin: e.g. Stesich. 7T9 (Abst.), Erasm. (Hes. 2T44 (*passim*), Ar. 17T64a (*bis*), 17T64b, *Mor. enc.* 26 (*bis*)); Régnier 1643; Collinet 1979, 244.

[75] English, French "apologue"; German "Apolog", Dutch "apoloog", Spanish "apólogo".

[76] The first vowel is long, unlike that of its homonym *fabula* (or *fabulus*), a diminutive of *faba* "bean".

[77] Vetter, sv, *TLL* 6.1, Leipzig: Teubner 1912-1926, col. 24: "I *i.q.* sermo", col. 26: "II *i.q.* narratio"; Walde, A., *Lateinisches etymologisches Worterbuch*, Heidelberg: Winter 1910², sv "'Rede, Sage'"; Meyer-Lubke 1911, sv: "1. 'Erzählung', 2. 'Fabel'"; Tucker, T.G., *A Concise Etymological Dictionary of Latin*, Halle (Saale): Niemeyer 1931, sv: "talk, tale, story, gossip"; Ernout, A.-Meillet, A., *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue latine. Histoire des mots*, Paris: Klincksieck 1979⁴, sv *for*, 245: "conversation, d'où 'sujet (ou objet) de conversation, récit'"; not: "redevoering" (Vandenberghe 1950, 17).

[78] Vetter lc; Ernout-Meillet lc.

[79] Contra Grottanelli, C., "Tricksters, Scapegoats, Champions, Saviors", *History of Religions* 23, 1983-1984, 123, on *App.* 10.

The following derivatives from *fabula* "fable" occur in Latin literature:

- *affabulatio* (Prisc. G70; Neo-Latin[80]): "pro-/epimythium" (cf. Prisc. lc)
- *confabulari* (Abst. *Praef.*, p. 533 Neveletus): "to make up a fable"
- *fabella*: see next subsection
- *fabulari* (Apu. *De deo Socr. prol.* 4 *bis*; Ar. 17T64a (Erasm.); cf. Pomey 1665, 15): "to make up a fable"[81]
- *fabularius* (Rom. Flor. *Expl.* (II 512 Hervieux)): "*fabularum inventor*" (*TLL* sv, without referring to Aesop)
- *fabulator* (Gell. G31; Neo-Latin[82]): "fabulist" (Lewis-Short 1879)
- *fabulosus* (Nat. Com. *Myth.* 9 (p. 633), translating ἐν Μυθιάμβοις (Tzetzes, referring to Babrius; see above, 1.3) by *in iambis fabulosis*)[83]
- cf. *fabulose* (Raim. Bit. *Kal. Dimn. Prooem.* (V 386 Hervieux))
- *praefabulatio* (Pomey 1665, 11-12): "promythium"

Fabula is the common word for "fable" in Medieval and Neo-Latin.[84] Various modern languages have borrowed both the word and its polysemy.[85]

---

[80] E.g. Aldus Manutius, *Aesopi Phrygis fabulae...*, Lugduni: Tornaesius 1551, *passim* (see Hobbs, A.S., *Fables*, London: Victoria and Albert Museum 1986, 42-43); Johannes Posthius, *Parerga poetica*, II, *s.l.* 1595, *passim*; Pomey 1665, 16-17, 19 (only for ἐπιμύθιον); Elschenbroich 1985, 46, n. 102. The term is adopted (and adapted) by Hassauer (1986, *passim*; see above, Chapter I, 2.11).

[81] *OLD*, sv *fabulor*; Hunink (V., "The Prologue of Apuleius' *De Deo Socratis*", *Mnemosyne* 48, 1995, 310), comparing ibid. 3 *ut...fabularer*, has observed that the second instance of *fabulari* is ambiguous, as it can be taken also as "to chat".

[82] Erasm. *Adag.* 2.8.25 (p. 644F); Pomey 1665, 9. Drogan (1847, 14) has "*fabulo[nes], apologorum auctor[es]*".

[83] See Luzzatto-La Penna 1986, pp. XLVIIIsq. Cf. Pomey 1665, 9 (*bis*).

[84] Medieval: e.g. Fred. *Chron.* 2.57 (*fabola*), 4.38; Alcuin. *Carm.* 278 *bis*; Cyrill. *Spec. Sap. Prol.*; anon. Avian. *passim*; *apol. Avian.* 6, 8; Nov. Avian. Par. 3.2; *rhythm. mor. passim*; Nicol. Perg. *Dial. creat. praef.*; *Disc. cler.* 4; Jac. Vitr. 83 Greven; Odo de Ceritona (Hervieux IV)). Neo-Latin: e.g. Laur. Vall. *Fac. mor. passim* (Ruelle 1986, 39-49); Bocc. *Geneal.* 14.9.96; Guar. *Aes. fab., passim*; Barb. *Aes. fab., passim*; Hes. 2T43-44 (Abst.); Erasm. (Hes. 2T44, Ar. 17T63b, 17T64a (*bis*), 17T64b, D. 40T13 (*ter*), Pl. 49T13 (*bis*)); Desbillons, F.-J., *Fabulae aesopiae*, Paris: Barbou 1778[6]; Collinet 1979, 249-251.

[85] English, French "fable" (Lindner 1978a, 13; Gaillard 1996, 11-15); German (Schafer 1955, 71; Grubmuller 1977, 15-16), Dutch, Danish, Norwegian "Fabel"; Spanish (Adrados 1979a, 18), Portuguese (see Portella 1983, 120) "fábula"; Italian "favola". Cf. Meyer-Lubke 1911 sv; Nøjgaard 1964, 129; Ziolkowski 1993, 16-17.

2.3 Fabella[86]

Fabella is a diminutive of *fabula* (see previous subsection). Much like *fabula*, *fabella* means "talk, narrative" and more specifically designates myths, dramas, and fables (Vetter, *TLL* sv, col. 6-7).

In Latin, the following fables are termed *fabella*:

- Republican Period: Hor. *S.* 2.6.78[87]
- Imperial Period: Phaedr. 1.2.9, 1.5.2, 1.15.3, 1.26.2, 2.5.6 (*vera fabella*), 3.3.3, 3.17.13, 4.2.9, 4.25.[1] and 23; Porph. *in* Hor. *Ep.* 1.1.74, 1.3.15, 1.7.13
- Fable collections: Avian. 8.2.

Besides, *fabella* designates "fable" as a genre in the following passages:

Phaedr. G13-14, Sen. G17, Plin. *NH* 36.82, Quint. G18ab, Eus. *Chron.* 2.94 Schoene (*Aes.* T9)

Phaedrus, Quintilian and Avianus[88] alternatively use *fabula* and *fabella* for "fable". Elsewhere, however, Phaedrus and Quintilian oppose *fabella* "fable" to *fabula* "tragedy" or "(fairy) tale".[89] *Fabella* "fable" also occurs in Neo-Latin literature.[90]

2.4 *Other Nouns*

As in Greek (see above, 1.4), occasionally, some other Latin words refer to particular fables or to fables in general. These are the following (in alphabetical order):[91]

---

[86] Omitted by Adrados 1979a, 18-19.

[87] Ib. 77-78: *anilis* | ...*fabellas*; cf. Petrarca, *Fam.* 3.13; Elschenbroich 1985, 23.

[88] Phaedr. G14.33, 36; Quint. 5.11.15; Avian. 8.2, G59; likewise Bocc. *Geneal.* 14.9.96, 117.

[89] Phaedr. 4.7.22; Quint. G18a; cf. Bertschinger 1921, 20-21; Currie (1984, 505 (if elsewhere (ib. 497) (mis)translating *fabellae* in Phaedrus by "anecdotes")); Costas Rodríguez 1985, 290-291 contra Nøjgaard 1964, 128-129. Nevertheless, Jedrkiewicz asserts: "La terminologia latina è sempre rimasta piuttosto omogenea: *fabula*...per Fedro, *fabella* per Quintiliano" (1989, 290).

[90] E.g. Laur. Vall. *Fac. mor. prol.* (ed. Ruelle 1986, 39); Erasm. (Ar. 17T63a (*bis*)); Dati, *Praef.* 3 and 42.3 (ed. Tacke 1912, 285 and 298); Desbillons, *op. cit.* (n. 84 above), p. XXIX (Collinet 1979, 249); Franco de Amelia 1, 2, 7 (ed. Finch 1978, 55-67); Bocc. *Geneal.* 14.9.117; Pol. *Lam.*, p. 226 Del Lungo (see Achelis 1920-1924, 121, n. 1).

[91] For *historiola*, see above, n. 59.

1. *argumentum*: Phaedr. 2.7.14, 4.8.2, 4.11.14, 4.17.7, 5.3.11;
2. *exemplum*: Phaedr. 1.3.3, G13.1, 2.1.11, 2.2.2, 3.10.2, 4.3.6, G16.10; Avian. 41.17; Medieval, Neo-Latin[92]; cf. Porph. *in* Hor. *Ep.* 1.7.13
3. *imago*: Hor. *Ep.* 1.7.34, *S.* 2.3.320;
4. *historia*: Phaedr. 4.6.2; see above, 1.4 ἱστορία;
5. *iocus*: Phaedr. (see above, G12, n. 29); Rom. G74a (*rec. gall.*) (in general); cf. Avian. G59; Gualt. Angl. *Prol.*2; cf. Nat. Com. *Myth.* 9 (p. 633);[93]
6. *narratio*[94]: Phaedr. 1.12.2, 4.5.2, 5.2.14; cf. Aug. G63; Liv. G11 *narrasse*;
7. *neniae*: Phaedr. G14.10, G15b.3;
8. *parabola*: Medieval and Neo-Latin[95]; see above, 1.4 παραβολή;
9. *sales*: Neo-Latin;[96]
10. *similitudo*: Medieval Latin[97];
11. *urbanitates*: Neo-Latin[98].

Again (as in Greek), the occurrence of these nouns (when referring to fables) is too sporadic to regard it as use of terminology, but they do testify to various relevant aspects of the genre, viz. its comical function (*iocus*, *neniae*, *sales*, *urbanitates*), narrative (*historia*, *narratio*; cf. *argumentum*) and metaphorical character (*imago*, *similitudo*; cf. *argumentum*, *exemplum*, *parabola*).

2.5 *Comparison*

There are only a few instances in which one author uses two or more different Latin terms to designate a fable or fables in general, whether

[92] Alex. Neq. *Nov. Aes.* 11 (cf. 7.29); anon. Avian. 1; *apol. Avian.* 40; Nov. Avian. Ast. *Prol.*; Ant.-Avian. 1, 3; *rhythm. mor.* 8.4, 10.4, 25.4, 34.3; Rom. G74a (*rec. gall.*) (in general); Rom. Angl. Nonn. 2.10; Gualt. Angl. 50; *Gesta Rom.* 51 Oesterley; *Disc. cler.*, *passim*; Jac. Vitr. 51, 55, 83 Grieven; cf. *rhythm. mor.* 39.2 *Exemplaris*; Franco de Amelia 4 *ex his doctrinae exemplaris*; Barb. *Aes. fab. Praef.* According to Oberg (1996a, 216), rendering "*Fallbeispiele (exempla)*", *exemplum* is "ein Begriff, der besser als das deutsche Wort 'Fabeln' sich als Sammelname auch für Phaedrus' Dichtungen eignet." In Phaedr. 4.3.6, curiously enough, Perry (1965, 305) translates *exemplum* by "parable".

[93] For *iocos* (*si vera lectio*) in Mart. 3.20.5, see above, n. 26.

[94] Cf. *narratiuncula* in Koster *ad* Ar. 17T22 (Σ) (*bis*).

[95] Rom. Vind. 10; Rom. Flor. 8; Rom. Nilant. 1.9, 1.13, 2.1; Rom. Mon. 11; Pomey 1665, 12, referring to D. 40F2 by "*hoc apologo seu parabola (utrumque idem est ac fabula)*"; cf. Carlson 1994, 33.

[96] Barb. *Aes. fab. Praef.*

[97] Anon. Avian. 2, 7, 16.

[98] Barb. *Aes. fab. Praef.*

in the same context or not. *Apologus* and *fabula* seem to be used for "fable" without distinction (Gell. G31[99], Apu. *De deo Socr. prol.* 4; Aus. G52 (*ter*); Neo-Latin[100]), as Iulius Victor already remarks (G49; cf. Fortun. G48).[101] The same goes for *fabula* and *fabella* in Avianus and in (some passages in) Phaedrus and Quintilian, as was pointed out above (2.3). In three (Neo-Latin) passages[102] three different terms (*apologus, fabula, fabella*) alternately designate the genre without apparent difference of meaning. It is unclear whether in the only passage (Sen. G17) where both a Greek and a Latin term (*logi* and *fabellae*, respectively) are used to designate the genre there is a distinction (and if so: what) between the two terms.[103]

3. Caveat

It goes without saying that the polysemy of the nouns discussed above demands a careful approach.[104] In some fables, or passages dealing with fables, (a derivative from) one of these nouns one time does, another time does not (or: does not, whereas another does), designate fables. Thus, in one and the same sentence Theon (G20c) twice uses μῦθος, first, as in the entire chapter, for "fable" (p. 74.14 Spengel), then in its original, neutral sense of "spoken word" (ib. 74.15); what is more, in the very first sentence λόγος means first "story" (ib. 72.28), then "pro-/epimythium" (ib. 72.30; see above, 1.3), but elsewhere in the same chapter also "fable" (ib. 73.37),

[99] Cf. De la Ville de Mirmont 1911, 280; Costas Rodríguez 1985, 292.

[100] Ar. 17T64a (17T63a *fabella*); id. (Erasm.) *Adag.* 1.4.18 (p. 188E), *Cop.* 2 (pp. 254-256 Knott; using *fabulae poetarum* for "myths"); Lorichius 1542, 9 ("*fabulas* ... *Libycas*", "*Libycorum Apologorum*"); Wolff *Phil. Pract.* 304 (Harth 1978, 57, n. 45); Gellert 1744, 74.

[101] Contra Janssens 1955, 7.

[102] Melanchthon, *Util. fab. passim* (cf. Hom. 1T6 Hes. 2T45 D. 40T13); Pomey 1665, 12 (quoted above, n. 95), 17 *fabella*; Abst. *Praef.*, pp. 533-534 Neveletus.

[103] Mazzoli (1970, 152) suggests that the former refers to fables in prose, the latter to verse fables.

[104] Thus, αἶνος does *not* mean "fable" in Call. *Aet. inc. lib.*, fr. 178.9-10 Pfeiffer; nor does λόγος in Archil. fr. 25 Adrados (contra Adrados' suggestion (1979a, 23)), Pl. *Phdr.* 275b, and Men. *Dysc.* 633; nor does μῦθος in Hes. *Op.* 206 (contra Lonsdale's suggestion (1989, 408)), Ar. *Lys.* 781, *Pl.* 177, *V.* 1179, Pl. *Grg.* 523a, *Plt.* 272c (bracketed by Burnet following Wohlrab), *R.* 350e and 377a, whereas Klinger's use of "fabula" (1961, 127, on Pherecr. fr. 117 *PCG*) is misunderstood by Josifović 1974, col. 39 (for all these passages, see the Appendix below).

"word" (ib. 77.2), "method" (ib. 77.9-10), and "oration" (ib. 78.9).[105] Philostratus (G43)[106] seems to play with this ambiguity when he twice writes λόγου in one sentence but first means "faculty of speech", then "pro-/epimythium", whereas μῦθος means "fable".[107] Likewise, the use of λόγος in S. 13F2 and of μῦθος in Pl. 49A1 seems to be equivocal. One definition (Luc. Tarrh. *ap.* Archil. 4T35 (Eust.)) has been seen above (1.3) to combine all three terms (αἶνος "fable", λόγος "story", and μυθικός "fictitious").

This polysemy is the more problematical when one word designates two different literary genres in the same context. Thus, Julian (G50) uses two words for one genre and one word for two genres: he terms "fable" both αἶνος and μῦθος, whereas μῦθος now means "fable", now "fairy-tale". Furthermore, Nicolaus (G64a) discriminates between μῦθοι "fables" and μῦθοι (or μυθικὰ διηγήματα)[108] "myths". Likewise (if more confusingly), Aphthonius (G54) uses μῦθος for "fable", but Doxapatres in his commentary *ad locum* for "myth" (see below, 32. Thucydides).

Mutatis mutandis, the same goes for Latin terminology.[109] Thus, Quintilian (G18a-c) designates "fable" by four different terms (*apologus*, *apologatio*, *fabula*, and *fabella*), while, *vice versa*, by *fabula* he also means "fairy-tale" and "tragedy" (besides "fable"). Finally, Isidore[110] (G75; cf. Macr. G60) distinguishes *fabulae*, *fabulae*, and *fabulae*, which is to say, comedies, myths, and fables.

On the other hand, the fact that αἶνος and αἴνιγμα can mean both "fable" and "enigma", and, likewise, αἶνος, λόγος, μῦθος, and παροιμία both "fable" and "proverb", is significant for the close connection between these three (sub)genres, which were all connected with Aesop's name (see below).

---

[105] Cf., in addition, the occurrence of three derivatives in the same chapter: ἄλογος "non-rational" (ib. 73.9), καταλογάδην "in prose" (ib. 73.26-27), ἐπίλογος "epimythium" (ib. 75.28-31; see above, 1.2).

[106] Cf. Hermog. G41 μῦθος "fable" (*passim*), λόγος "speech" (pp. 2.13, 3.13 Rabe), "moral" (ib. 4.1).

[107] Cf. Fairbanks, A., *Philostratus. Imagines...*, Loeb (: Heinemann/Putnam), 1931, 13, n. 2; Bougot, A., *Philostrate. La Galerie de Tableaux*, Paris: Les Belles Lettres 1991, 13. Compare the pun in Psel. *Orat.* 25.137-138 Littlewood: Ἀλλ' ἐπεὶ εἰς μῦθον ἡμῖν ὁ λόγος κατέληξεν, ἀρχὴν τοῦ περὶ τὸν μῦθον λόγου τὸν λόγον ποιήσομαι.

[108] Quoted above, n. 57; see also G64b. Cf. Bompaire 1958, 444, n. 4.

[109] See also the examples given above, 2.2-3, 2.5.

[110] On "l'équivoque du chapitre *De fabula*", see Fontaine 1959, 176sqq; cf. Wackers 1984, 691-692. Fisher (1987, 87), however, taking the chapter to deal with fables only, deems it "one of the clearest".

4. *Fabulists*

4.1 *Aesop*

A discussion of the historicity of the legendary fabulist falls outside the scope of this study. Therefore, this subsection concentrates on formal aspects of the use of Aesop's name.

The polysemy of the nouns discussed above is often reduced by a connection with the name of Aesop.[111] The name of Aesop emerges in the Classical Period. Already then, the polysemous nouns are specified by a connection with his name in formally different ways. Aesop may be termed "maker of fables"[112] (Hdt. 2.134). He may be presented as narrator of fables. Most, but not all (e.g. Ar. 17F6), of these fables are presented as being told by Aesop on a particular occasion of his legendary life. To put it differently, anecdotes about Aesop frequently serve as a literary frame-work for these fables. Aesop is, and can be considered to be, both narrator of these fables and character figuring in these anecdotes. Thus, such fables which are embedded in anecdotes may have served as an intermediary stage for fables in which Aesop is a character. Finally, fables, or fable characters, may also be called "Aesop's", or "Aesopic" (Αἰσώπειος, Αἰσωπικός[113], *Aesopius*[114], *Aesopicus*). Connections of fable characters with Aesop's name are ἀπὸ κοινοῦ. Thus, "the Aesopic dog" (Democr. 47A1) is a succinct expression for: "the Aesopic fable about the dog", or: "the dog in the Aesopic fable".

It must have been so common to specify the genre by a connection with Aesop's name that even pre-Aesopian fables were ascribed to Aesop, as a scholiast (G66b) observes when Aristophanes (17A3) does so with an Archilochean fable (4F1). Most ancient, and many modern, fabulists typically term their collections of fables "Aesopic" (Dem. Phal. (*ap.* D.L. 5.80), Babr., Phaedr., *fab. aes.*, Rom.). Phaedrus (G13.1) even calls fable "Aesop's genre" and confesses (G16.1-3), if

---

[111] It should, however, be noted that not everything ascribed to Aesop is a fable; see the Appendix under [Aesopus], Alexis, and Posidippus, as well as nn. 130-131 below. A striking example is Nicol. *Prog.* (p. 22 Felten; *Aes.* S11 (2 Hock-O'Neil 1986)): Αἴσωπος ὁ μυθοποιὸς ἐρωτηθεὶς τί ἰσχυρότατον ⟨τῶν⟩ ἐν ἀνθρώποις· '⟨ὁ⟩ λόγος' ἀπεκρίνατο, λόγος meaning "speech", not "fable".

[112] Cf. the *hapax legomenon* Αἰσωποποιητοί in Ar. 17T62 (Erasm.), for which see, however, below, n. 132.

[113] For Αἰσωπίτανος, see below, n. 130.

[114] "*Aesopeus*" occurs in Luzzatto-La Penna (1986, *in titulo*).

not without irony[115], that Aesop's name is added "for the sake of his prestige"[116]; Aesop is the fabulist *par excellence.*[117]

Although these connections differ formally, they do not necessarily refer to different types of fables. In the Classical Period, they seem to be more or less synonymous. Thus, Aristophanes refers to the fable of the Eagle and the Beetle as belonging to "Aesop's fables" (17A2), and elsewhere (17F5) presents the same fable as *told by* Aesop in Delphi. Philocleon tells a fable in which Aesop is the *protagonist* (17F2), obviously because his son had previously recommended the use of "Aesopic" fables (G1c).[118] Furthermore, Aristotle (G5) exemplifies "Aesopic" fables by "Stesichorus'" and "Aesop's" fable; these men are presented as *narrating* these fables on particular occasions. More examples could be given in which the label "Aesop's" or "Aesopic" is applied to a fable allegedly *narrated by* Aesop on a particular occasion (e.g. Arist. 57F1, and Socr. 25F1, respectively). It remains possible, though, that formally different connections with the name of Aesop do refer to different kinds of fables. Phaedrus (G15a) discriminates between "Aesop's" and "Aesopic" fables, by which he means, respectively, fables composed *by* Aesop himself and fables *à la* Aesop but composed by himself (that is, by Phaedrus).[119] Elsewhere, however, the genitive and the adjective are used without apparent distinction (Hsch. G69a; compare Ar. G1a with G1c).

In antiquity, and ever since[120], it has been argued that the label "Aesopic" does refer to a particular kind of fables, characterized by the stock of characters. A scholium (*in* Ar. G66a) restricts the characters of Aesopic fables to non-rational animals[121], to which Isidore (G75) adds lifeless objects (including plants). Another scholium (*in* Ar. G67b; cf. Tricl. ibid. (*in V.* 1259a)), conversely, asserts that Aesopic fables feature human protagonists, whereas two others (Σ *in* Aphth., II 8 Walz; Nicol. G64a) hold that Aesopic fables feature both non-rational and rational beings.

---

[115] 8-9 *adeo fucatae plus vetustati favet | Invidia mordax quam bonis praesentibus.*

[116] Translation by Perry 1965, 351.

[117] Cf. Plin. *NH* 36.82 *Aesopi fabellarum philosophi*; Jul. G50 Ὁ δὲ δὴ τῶν μύθων Ὅμηρος ἢ Θουκυδίδης ἢ Πλάτων, ἢ ὅτι βούλει καλεῖν αὐτόν, Αἴσωπος ἦν ὁ Σάμιος.

[118] Contra Sommerstein 1983, 240.

[119] *paucas ille* [sc. *Aesopus*] *ostendit, ego plures sero,* | *usus vetusto genere sed rebus novis*; cf. G14.38-39, 4.22.8.

[120] E.g. (most recently) by Oberg 1996a, 243: "'äsopische', also Tier- und Tier-Mensch-Fabeln".

[121] Likewise Ar. 17T62 (Erasm.).

Theon (G20c) definitely opposes such definitions. Theon and other theoreticians[122] state that fables are generally called "Aesopic" simply because Aesop frequently used (not: invented) fables. Besides, expressions like "Aesop's Momus" (Arist. 57A2) and "Aesop's Hunter" (Plu. *Arat.* 38.9) show that in Aesop's fables also gods and human beings occur as characters. Furthermore, in many fables which, in one way or another, are connected with Aesop's name, human beings (e.g. Aesop himself) or gods (e.g. Zeus) occur as characters, either exclusively or in combination with non-rational characters.[123]

After the Classical Period, more variations of the use of Aesop's name to designate the genre of fable emerge. He is presented as writer of fables. The expression "in Aesop" also points to a written tradition (which is not to say that fables did no longer circulate orally).[124]

Finally, it is noteworthy that many aetiological[125] and mythological[126] tales are associated with the name of Aesop, alike with animal fables. Apparently, it was quite common to class these all in one and the same group.

The following fables are connected with the name of Aesop:

Aesop as "maker/composer" of fables

- Classical Period: in general: Hdt. 2.134 (*Aes.* T13)
- Imperial Period:
- D. Chr. 12.7-8 (ξυνέστησεν), 72.14-16 (ξυνετίθει)
- in general: [Babr. G19c]; Theon G20c; D.Chr. G23; Plu. G25d; Max. Tyr. G34; *Vit. Aesop.* G40b; Phryn. *PS*, p. 86 De Borries (λογοπλάθος); Jul. G51; Him. G55; Them. G57
- Latin: Rom. (*rec. gall.*) 54, 56 (*auctor*) Thiele

[122] Ps.-Diogenian. G28; Hermog. G41; Aphth. G54; Prisc. G70; cf. Quint. G18b.

[123] To give some examples from the *Vita Aesopi*: 33G only gods, 67GW only human beings, 99GW human being and animal, 135-139GW animals and god; see Van Dijk 1995b and 1996a, 530-541 *passim*.

[124] Cf. Ziolkowski 1993, 29; the previous chapter, nn. 228-229.

[125] Ar. 17F6 (cf. 17T16c (Σ); Tricl. ibid.); Call. 20F1; Pl. 49F1; Arist. 57A2, 57F1 (and 57T2-3 (Alex. Aphr., Olymp.)); *Vit. Aesop.* 33G, 67GW, 68GW, 126GW; Plu. *Mor.* 609F, *Arat.* 30.8; D.Chr. 32.63-65, 66; Philostr. *VA* 5.15; Them. *Or.* 32, 359d; Two Wallets (Plu. *Crass.* 32.5; Gal. *Aff. Dign.* 2.7, *In Hipp. Prorrh.* 1.2.13, *Pecc. Dign.* 2.8; Them. *Or.* 21, 262b; Stob. 3.23.6); Phaedr. 4.<15->16. Cf. Perry 1940, 402; 1962, 301 (above, Chapter I.I, 1.2).

[126] *Vit. Aesop.* 94GW; Plu. *Mor.* 645B; cf. Max. Tyr. 36.1; Him. *Or.* 66.

Aesop as narrator (whether or not connected with an episode of his legendary life)

- Classical Period: Ar. 17F5-6; Pl. 49F1; Arist. 39F2, 57F1
- Hellenistic Period: Call. 20F1 (cf. 20F2 οἱ πάλαι Λυδοί)
- Imperial Period:
  - *Vit. Aesop.* 33G, 67GW, 68GW, 94GW, 97GW, 99GW, 126GW, 129GW, 131GW, 133GW, 135-139GW, 140GW, 141<G>W[127]; *fab. aes.* 8 Hausrath; [Babr. 22.6]; Socr. 25T1 (D.L.); D.Chr. 32.63-65 (ἀνθρώπου Φρυγός, Αἰσώπου συγγενοῦς), ib. 66, 33.16; Plu. *Mor.* 150AB; Luc. *Fug.* 13 (φησι); *Herm.* 84, *Icar.* 10; Max. Tyr. 15.5 (ὁ Φρύξ; potentialis), G34; Philostr. *VA* 7.30 (φησι); Plu. *Mor.* 150AB, ib. 156A, ib. 609F, ib. 1067EF (φησιν), *Arat.* 30.8 (φησιν); Gal. *Aff. Dign.* 2.7 (φησιν); Lib. *Or.* 18.19 (irrealis); Them. *Or.* 13.174c, *Or.* 16.208a, *Or.* 21.262b, *Or.* 32.359bc (λέγει (*bis*)), ib. 359d (λέγει), *Περὶ ἀρετῆς* (Syriac version); Ar. 17T27a (Σ); Arist. 57T2-3 (Alex. Aphr., Olymp.); Stob. 3.23.6; Ps.-Dos. 15 Hausrath (p. 45 Goetz)
  - in general: Babr. G19a.15-16[128], G19b.3-4; Theon G20c: ἐχρήσατο; Ps.-Diogenian. G28: πλεονάσαντος; Hermog. G41: ἐχρῆτο; Philostr. G43; Jul. G50; Him. G56; Agath. G71
  - Ancient Christian Greek: Clem. Al. *Strom.* 7.6.33
- Latin:
  - Phaedr. 1.2, 1.6, 4.<15->16 (*senex*), 4.18 (*finxit*), *App.* 12; Apu. *De deo Socr. prol.* 4 (*fabulatur*); Ps.-Dos., p. 45 Goetz; Serv. *in* Verg. *G.* 1.378 (*dicit*); Rom. (*rec. gall.*) 1, 3 (*retulit*), 17+61 (*auctor*), 21+23 (*auctor, subiecit*), 27, 32 (*ponit auctor*), 44 (*auctor dixit*), 43+50+58 (*auctor posuit* (vv)), 59 (*auctor prosequitur*), 60 (*auctor...refert*), 62 (*auctor...subiecit*), 63 (*auctor...dixit*), 93 (*auctor retulit*), 95 Thiele
  - in general: Gell. G31; Avian. G59; Prisc. G70

Aesop as a character[129]

- Classical Period: Ar. 17F2
- Imperial Period: D.Chr. 34.5 (Φρύξ); Philostr. *VA* 5.15
- Latin: Phaedr. 2.3, 3.3, 3.5, 3.14, 3.19, 4.5, *App.* 9, *App.* 13 (*Phryx*), *App.* 17, *App.* 20

"Aesop's"

- Classical Period:
  - "~ fable"
    - Ar. 17A2-3; Pl. 49A1; Arist. 39F2, 57F1
    - in general: Ar. G1a (γέλοιον (cf. Ar. G1c; Hsch. G69a)); Pl. G3 (*bis*);
  - "~ [character]": Arist. 57A2 (Momus)

---

[127] *Aes.* T60 ("Fabulas quas ipse Aesopus per varias occasiones narrasse dicitur") has many wrong numbers, and omits Call., *Vit. Aesop.* 126 and Plu. *Conv.*

[128] On the text of these lines, see Vaio 1982.

[129] *Aes.* T61 ("Fabulae in quibus Aesopus primas agit partes") omits Philostr. and D.Chr. and includes *Vit. Aesop.* 37, which is not a fable (see Van Dijk 1994a, 96; 1995b, 132-133, n. 7; 1996a, 521).

- Imperial Period:
  - "~ fable":
    - Gal. *Adv. Jul.* 8, *Aff. Dign.* 2.7; Max. Tyr. G33 (τοῦ Φρυγός), G35 (τοῦ Λυδοῦ) ("~ wisdom"); Ael. *VH* 10.5; Lib. *Or.* 62.44; Chor. 18(*Dial.* 10).5; Th. 32T1 (Σ); [Babr. 40.5]
    - in general: Philostr. G44; Eust. Antioch. G46; Hsch. G69a
    - "~ [character]": Plu. *Mor.* 155B (σεαυτοῦ) (Fox), ib. 157B (Dog), ib. 806EF (Wren), *Arat.* 38.9 (Hunter); Gal. *Pecc. Dign.* 2.8 (Wallets); Luc. *Pseud.* 5 (Jackdaw); Ael. *VH* 10.5 (Swine); Them. *Or.* 21.245ab (Ass), *Or.* 22.278d-279a (Fox)
- Latin:
  - "~ fable":
    - Phaedr. 1.10.3; Gell. G31 *bis*; Porph. *in* Hor. *S.* 2.5.56; Pseudacr. *in* Hor. *Ep.* 2.3(*AP*).437 *bis*, ib. *S.* 2.3.299, ibid. 5.56; Rom. (*rec. gall.*) 6, 45 (*auctoris*), 48 (*auctoris*), 57, 65 (*auctoris*), 74 (*auctoris*), 77 (*auctoris*), 92 (*auctoris*) Thiele
    - in general: Phaedr. G13 ("~ genre"), G14 ("~ pen"), 4.22.4 (absolute, in general), G16.1 ("~ name"); Quint. G18a; Fortun. G48; Macr. G60; Mart. Cap. G62; Isid. G75
- Ancient Christian Latin:
  - "~ fable":
    - Hier. *Ep.* 79.3
    - in general: Aug. G63, *Cons. Evang.* 1.12
    - "~ [character]": Hier. *Ep.* 108.15 (Crow); Iren. *adv. Haer.* 2.11.1 (Dog); Tert. *adv. Marc.* 23.2 (Well), ib. 3 (Well), *adv. Val.* 12 (Jackdaw)
- Neo-Latin:
  - "~ fable": Laur. Vall. *Fac. mor. prol.*

"Aesopic"[130]

- Classical Period:
  - "~ fable", in general: Ar. G1c; Arist. G5
  - "~ [character]": Democr. 47A1 (Dog)
- Hellenistic Period: "~ fable", in general: Dem. Phal. *ap.* D.L. 5.80 (*Aes.* T74)
- Imperial Period:
  - "~ fable"[131]:
    - D.H. 6.86.1-3 ("in the ~ way"); SE *M.* 8.103; Gal. *In Hipp. Prorrh.* 1.2.13; Him. G56; Demad. 41T1 (*fab. aes.*); Ar. 17T6 (Symm.); Arist. 57T2-3 (Alex. Aphr., Olymp.)

---

[130] Αἰσωπίτανος, a *hapax legomenon* (*SEG* 39.1062) referring to a κεραμίς "*made in the manner of Aesop*, i.e. having a sententious inscription" (LSJ, *Rev. Suppl.* sv), refers to fables only indirectly.

[131] Αἰσώπειον (*Vit. Aesop.* 100G(Αἰσώπιον Perry)W) and Αἰσώπειον αἷμα (Arist. fr. 487 Rose *ap.* Zen. (p. 369 Miller), 1.47; Diogenian. 1.46, 1.20 V; *Suda*, αι 332 Adler; Macar. 1.60, 8.47; Apostol. 1.73, 77 (Arsen. 2.35) (*Aes.* T27)) refer to Aesop's life, not to his fables.

- in general: Quint. G18b[132]; Theon G20c; Ps.-Diogenian. G28; Hermog. G41, *Id.* 2.3 (Nicostr.)[133]; *PMich.* G45.6; Aphth. G54; Nicol. G64a; Σ *in* Ar. G66a, G67b; Hsch. G69a; Olymp. G72; anon. *Prol. Phil. Pl.* G73
- "~ [character]":
  - Plu. *Mor.* 490C (Hen), ib. 500CD (Fox), ib. 614EF (Crane and Fox), ib. 790CD (Fox)
  - in general: Plu. G25c (ἐμούς) (Jackdaws and Ravens)
- Ancient Christian Greek: "~ fable": Bas. *Ep.* 189.2 (Greg. Nyss. *ad Eust.* ?)
- Latin:
  - "~ fable":
    - Porph. *in* Hor. *Ep.* 1.1.74
    - in general: Phaedr. G15a.11; Prisc. G70; Isid. G75
  - "~ [character]": Apu. *De deo Socr. prol.* 4 (*suo*) (Raven)
- Ancient Christian Latin: "~ [character]": Hier. *Ep.* 29.7 (Dog)

"Aesop" *ohne weiteres*
- Imperial Period:
  - Plu. *Mor.* 645B, *Crass.* 32.5
  - in general: Philostr. G42-43; Him. G56
- Latin:
  - Phaedr. 1.3.3, 4.7.5
  - in general: Phaedr. G12 (*repperit*); Isid. G75
- Neo-Latin: Laur. Vall. *Fac. mor. expl.*

Aesop as writer
- Imperial Period: in general: *Vit. Aesop.* G40c; Aphth. G54; Them. G57 (ἀπολέλοιπεν)
- Latin: Porph. *in* Hor. *S.* 2.3.299 (*tradit*); Rom. G74b (*rec. gall.*)

"in Aesop" ((παρ(ὰ τῷ)) Αἰσώπῳ; *in* <*A*>*esopo*)
- Imperial Period: Max. Tyr. G34; Philostr. *VA* 7.30; Him. G56
- Ancient Christian Greek: Bas. *Ep.* 334
- Medieval Latin: *apol. Avian.* 37

"according to Aesop" (κατὰ τὸν Αἴσωπον)
- Imperial Period: Plu. *Mor.* 79A; Him. G56

It is striking that in poetry, except in Aristophanic comedy and in fable collections (Babrius, Phaedrus), fables are never connected with the name of Aesop. Between individual authors a wide variation in

[132] Early editions read αἰσωποποίητον, "nec per se commendabilis, nec ullo Graeco auctore defensa" (Spalding, G.L., *M. Fabii Quintiliani de Institutione Oratoria libri duodecim*, Leipzig 1803 (repr. Hildesheim: Olms 1969), 319 (but cf. above, n. 112)).

[133] Hermogenes does not report that Nicostratus composed "myths", some of which "are like the fables of Aesop" (contra Wooten, C.W., *Hermogenes'* On Types of Style, Chapel Hill/London: U of North Carolina P 1987, 126), but that he composed, *inter alia*, "Aesopic fables".

connecting fables with Aesop's name can be observed. Some authors connect almost all fables they use with Aesop's name (e.g. Themistius), others almost none (e.g. Libanius). Plutarch and Tertullianus apparently prefer an ἀπὸ κοινοῦ connection of Aesop's name with a fable character.

Besides fables, proverbs and riddles are associated in antiquity with Aesop.[134]

4.2 *Other Fabulists*

Incidentally, particular fables or fables in general are connected with the names of other fabulists than Aesop. Six fabulists are mentioned, three of which (Babrius, Phaedrus, Avianus) are historical, whereas the historicity of the existence of the other three (Cybisses, Thurus, Connis) cannot be ascertained.

1. Babrius.[135] The following fables are connected with the name of Babrius:

- "Babrius'"
  - Imperial Period: Jul. *Ep.* 82, 444B
  - Byzantine Period: Tz. *H.* 13.251-265 (475) *c.* Σ *ad loc.* (258), ib.487-490 (490) *c.* Σ *ad loc.* (490)
  - Neo-Latin literature: Nat. Com. *Myth.* 9 (p. 633)
- Babrius as writer
  - Latin: in general: Avian. G59
  - Byzantine Period: Tz. *H.* 13.251-265 (475); *Suda*, σ 1030 Adler
- Babrius *ohne weiteres*
  - Byzantine Period: *Suda* (not always rightly), α 1484, 2585, 4155, 4681, γ 183, ε 357, 3268, 3559 (ἐν Μυθικοῖς), η 144, 447, κ 280, 1863 (ἐν τοῖς Μυθικοῖς), 2245, 2260, 2424, ν 122, 126, 163 (ἐν Μυθικοῖς), ο 332 (φησιν), π 46, 197, 1388, 1579, 2298, 3225, σ 850, 938, τ 69, 695, 966, φ 644, 718 Adler; *EM* sv ὄμφαξ

2. Phaedrus[136]

- Latin: in general: Avian. G59
- "Phaedrian": Neo-Latin[137]

---

[134] See Perry 1952, 243-258 (*sententiae*), 259-292 (*proverbia*); Adrados 1979a, 35-36, 218; Van Dijk 1993d, 173, n. 8, with further literature.

[135] For the frequent, if false, connection of the (Pseudo-)Ignatius *Tetrastichs* with the name of Babrius (Babrias, Gabrias; cf. the previous chapter, G19a, n. 45), see Van Dijk 1996b, 161-163.

[136] For *Phaedri* in Mart. 3.20.5, see above, n. 26.

[137] Régnier 1643.

3. Avianus
    - *ohne weiteres*: Medieval Latin[138]

4. Cybisses/Cybissus[139]
    - in general: Chamael. G6, Babr. G19b, Theon G20c, Ps.-Diogenian. G28, Hsch. G69b

5. Thurus
    - in general: Theon G20c

6. Connis
    - in general: Theon G20c

5. *Geographical Adjuncts*

In Greek and, less frequently, Latin literature, fables are sometimes called (in alphabetical order) "Carian", "Cilician", "Cyprian", "Egyptian", "Libyan", "Lydian", "Phrygian", and "Sybaritic"[140]. This subsection briefly considers whether connections of the nouns discussed above with these geographical adjuncts refer to particular kinds or types of fables.

First, an overview of the evidence.

5.1 *Carian (Καρικός)*

Only one fable is (thrice) termed Carian:

Simon. 9F1; Timocr. 10F2; Macar. 5.9

Besides, Theon (G20c) speaks about Carian fables in general.

5.2 *Cilician (Κιλίκιος, Κίλιξ)*

Cilician fables in general are mentioned by:

Theon G20c; *PMich.* G45; Aphth. G54.

---

[138] Jo. Sares. *Pol.* 7.24, 703b.

[139] Dated by Jacobs (1894, p. XVII, 196) "c. 50 A.D.", by Heijbroek (1941, 40, n. 2) "± 50 v. Chr.".

[140] Fabricius (1718, 396) adds a Ionian, Giordano (1990, 185, n. 376) a Thracian variety. However, the former misinterprets Sotad. *ap. Sudam* (σ 871 Adler), the latter Hdt. 2.134 (*Aes.* T13).

5.3 *Cyprian (Κύπριος, Cyprius)*

Only one[141] fable is termed Cyprian:

Timocr. 10F1

Besides, Cyprian fables in general are mentioned by:

Theon G20c; Hermog. G41; *PMich.* G45.7; Aphth. G54; Prisc. G70.

5.4 *Egyptian (Αἰγύπτιος)*

Egyptian fables in general are mentioned by:

Theon G20c; *PMich.* G45; Him. G56.

5.5 *Libyan (Λιβυκός, Λιβυστῖνος, Λιβυστικός, Lybicus, Lybisticus)*

Only one[142] fable is termed Libyan:

A. 12F1 (*et ap.* Ps.-Diogenian. G29); cf. Λίβυσσα γέρανος: Babr. 65.1ab *ap. Sudam*, γ 183 Adler; Λίβυσσα στρουθός: *Tetr.* 1.22, *Suda* sv (ἡ στρουθοκάμηλος; cf. Arist. *PA* 695a17).

Besides, Libyan fables in general are mentioned by:

Arist. G5; Chamael. G6[143]; Quint. G18b[144]; cf. Babr. G19b; Theon G20c; Theo Sm. G29; Hermog. G41; *PMich.* G45.7; Him. G56; Hsch. G69b; Prisc. G70; Isid. G75.

5.6 *Lydian (Λύδιος)*

Nicolaus (G64a) discusses Lydian fables in general.

There are four[145] pseudo-Lydian, but really Aesopic, fables:

Call. 20F1-2; Plu. *Mor.* 150AB; Max. Tyr. G35

[141] Von Leutsch (1874ab) adds D.Chr. *Or.* 64 and Sotion *ap.* Stob. 4.44.59 (cf. Hense *ad loc.*). However, the former is not a fable, the latter not a Cyprian one (cf. Dressel 1876, 17).

[142] For D.S. 38F1, see below, Chapter II.VIII, n. 67. Meineke's conjecture Λιβυκός (*pro* γυναικός) in Sotion's μῦθος *ap.* Stob. 4.44.59 (cf. Dressel 1876, 17; Plu. *Mor.* 112A, 609F; *Aes.* 462) was not accepted by Hense; nor was his alternative Φρυγιακός. D.Chr.'s μῦθος Λιβυκός (*Or.* 4.73, 5; Phot. *Bibl.* 107, 165b41-42) is an allegory (cf. Cohoon, J.W., *Dio Chrysostom*, I, Loeb, 1932 (repr. 1961), 235, 245).

[143] For which, see Lorenzoni, A., "Chamael. fragm. novum", *MCr* 13-14, 1978-1979, 321-322.

[144] *TGL* (sv μυθικός) reads μυθικούς, not λιβυκούς.

[145] For Hdt. 31F1, see below, Chapter II.VIII, n. 13.

Plutarch's fable has a Lydian setting (ἡμίονος...Λυδός) but is narrated by Aesop. In Maximus' fable ὁ Λυδός is Aesop, who, according to some, came from Lydia (cf. *Aes.* T7). Likewise, the marked Lydian *couleur locale* of Callimachus' fourth *Iamb* (20F2) (ascribed to οἱ πάλαι Λυδοί) seems to be a subtle reference to Aesop[146], as the fable mentions both the river flowing through (106 Πακτω[λόν), and the mountain dominating (6 ἐ⌊ν...Τμώλῳ[147]), the capital of Lydia, from which city the fabulist was said to be in the second *Iamb* (20F1.16-17 Α⌊ἴσω⌋πος | ὁ Σαρδιηνὸς).

5.7 *Phrygian (Φρύγιος)*

Theon (G20c) and Nicolaus (G64a) deal with Phrygian fables in general.

Besides, there are some pseudo-Phrygian, but in reality Aesopic, fables (cf. previous subsection):

D.Chr. 32.63-63, ib. 66, 34.5; Max. Tyr. 15.5, G32-33; Ael. *VH* 10.5 (explicitly); Phaedr. *App.* 13 (cf. G14.52).[148]

The first two fables are told by "a Phrygian relative of Aesop". In the other ones ὁ Φρύξ/*Phryx* is to be equated with Aesop, and Φρύγιος with Aesopic, since Aesop allegedly originated from, among other regions, Phrygia (*Aes.* T4); cf. Him. G56 and Serv. *in* Verg. *A.* 1.182, who calls Aesop's daughter "Phrygia".

5.8 *Sybaritic (Συβαριτικός, Sybariticus)*

Two fables are termed Sybaritic:

Ar. 17F3 (*et ap.* 17T8 (Ps.-Diogenian. G28)), 17F4 (*et ap.* 17T10 (anon. *Περὶ αἴνου* G39)).

Besides, the following passages speak about Sybaritic fables in general:

Ar. G1c; Mnesim. G4; Theon G20c; Hermog. G41; *PMich.* G45.7; Aphth. G54; Nicol. G64a; Σ *in* Ar. G66a, G67b; Hsch. G69d; Prisc. G70.

---

[146] Contra Du Méril 1854, 19, n. 2; Giordano 1990, 185, n. 376; contra: Hausrath 1909, col. 1722; cf. Hertzberg 1846, 104; Rutherford 1883, p. XXXVIII.

[147] If not in Eustathius' *variae lectiones*, for which see below, Call. 20F2, n. 75.

[148] For Sotion *ap.* Stob. 4.44.59, see above, n. 142. Fabricius (1718, 395-396) added Democr. *ap.* D.L. 9.7 (49; 68A33 Diels-Kranz: Φρύγιος λόγος) and Diagor. *ap.* Tat., *Sudam* δ 523 Adler.

5.9 *Comparison*

The majority of the theoreticians who speak about these local variants besides Aesopic fables does not mention essential differences. Four passages juxtapose Aesopic and Sybaritic (Ar. G1c)[149] or Libyan (Arist. G5, Quint. G18a, Babr. G19b)[150] fables in general, without, however, mentioning any distinguishing features. Mnesimachus' statement (G4; *ap.* Σ *in* Ar. G66a) that Sybaritic fables are short is inconsequential, as the same might be said of other subspecies. Hesychius (G69d)[151] reports that the denomination "Sybaritic fables" originates from Aesop's stay in Italy[152]; this curious aetiology may have been made up by the lexicographer for the occasion, but justifies the deduction that Hesychius considered Sybaritic and Aesopic fables to be synonymous. Theon (G20c) plausibly states that the only difference between the local variants is the origin of the narrator of the fable in question. Comparably, Ps.-Diogenianus (G28) regards these fables as indigenous variants which differ only in name. Somewhat differently, some testimonies[153] derive the names of these indigenous kinds from their inventors.

However, some ancient authors do give preciser definitions of one or some of these fables. Nicolaus (G64a) and a scholium (*in* Ar. G66a) restrict the characters of Sybaritic fables to human beings[154]. Another scholium (*in* Ar. G67b; cf. Tricl. ibid. (*in V.* 1259a)), conversely, contends that the characters in Sybaritic fables are quadrupeds. Nicolaus moreover states that in Lydian and Phrygian[155] fables only animals

---

[149] Cf. Phot. *Lex.* sv Συβαριτικοὶ λόγοι; *Suda*, σ 1271 Adler: καὶ Συβαριτικοὶ λόγοι, οἱ Αἰσώπειοι.

[150] Drogan (1847, 11), 'emending' Babr. G19b.5-6 ("mendosum") into Λίβυς ψιλοὺς | λόγους, suggested that "videri potest Babrius significasse apologos pedestri oratione conceptos, qui opponerentur fabulis metro inclusis", which is, however, not in accordance with A. 12F1, the only extant specimen.

[151] Paraphrased by Erasmus (*Adag.* 1.6.56 (pp. 245-246), 4.7.10 (pp. 1100-1101), reading Ἄκωπον ("Sybaritam opinor") *pro* Αἴσωπον), whose interpretation of the passage, however, (but not the problematic *varia lectio*) was challenged by Stephanus.

[152] Rohde (1914, 587), conversely, assumes that Aesop's alleged sojourn in *Magna Graecia* served to explain the attribution of Sybaritic fables to him.

[153] Chamael. G6, Hermog. G41, Aphth. G54, Hsch. G69b, Prisc. G70; cf. Scaliger 1561, 139: "*ab inuentoribus, aut ab vsu frequenti nationum*". Less plausible explanations are given by Pomey 1665, 9.

[154] Likewise Ar. 17T62 (Erasm.); Paduano, G., *Tragedie e frammenti di Sofocle*, Torino 1982, 235, n. 62. Σ *in* Aphth. (II 12 Walz) explains: ὅτι οἱ μὲν Συβαρῖται τρυφηλοὶ ὄντες ἐκ μόνων λογικῶν ζώων μύθους ἐξεῦρον.

[155] Not Libyan fables too (contra Pignani 1983, 19 (as well as contra Freese 1926, 273, n. c)).

occur. Isidore (G75) asserts that Libyan fables confront animals with men. Because of the lacunal state of the papyrus, it remains unclear whether or not *PMich.* (G45).8sqq restricts the characters of one or more kinds to animals, and if so, of which particular kind(s).[156]

To these restrictive definitions two objections can be raised.[157] In the first place, they are based upon too little evidence.[158] The above overview of the evidence shows that few, if any, specimens have come down to us: of only one variant two examples are extant (Sybaritic), of some only one (Carian, Cyprian, Libyan), of others none at all (Cilician, Egyptian). It is far from safe to generalize from one or two instances. It has been asserted[159] that Cyprian fables typically feature female animals and are told to human beings of the same sex, but one could equally well infer from Pseudo-Diogenianus' exemplification (G28) that all Carian fables are about marine animals and apply to fishermen! Some specimens strut with borrowed plumage: the extant pseudo-Lydian and pseudo-Phrygian fables are, in fact, "crypto-Aesopic" references to the legendary fabulist's alleged native regions.

Secondly, the definitions are not even in accordance with the extant specimens. In one Sybaritic fable from Aristophanes (17F4) an anthropomorphized object (a jar[160]) figures as speaking character, which militates against Nicolaus and the scholiast who restrict the characters of such fables to human beings. In Aeschylus' Libyan fable (12F1), strictly speaking, only an animal, viz. an eagle, occurs, and not, as Isidore (G75) states[161], a human being in addition, although other versions[162] of this fable do add one (a hunter).

---

[156] In this context α[δ]ιαφορων ⟦αδιαφορ⟧ "not different" occurs (which Winter (1922, 140), curiously enough, translates by "different").

[157] Pawate (1986, 88-89, cf. 112), however, proceeds to apply Isidore's distinction to the fable collections.

[158] The same goes for Σ *in* Aphth. (II 12 Walz): οἱ δὲ Κίλικες καὶ Κύπριοι ἐμπορευόμενοι καὶ τόπους ἀγνώστους διερχόμενοι ἐνεπλάσαντο τοὺς ἐξ ἀλόγων ζώων μύθους, ὡς ἑωρακότες ἐν τόποις τισὶ ξένην μορφὴν ἔχοντα ζῶα.

[159] By Leutsch 1874b (cf. above, n. 141); contra: Dressel 1876, 17.

[160] Ar. 17F4.1436: ἐχῖνος; mistranslated by Nøjgaard (1964, 457) with "tortue"; see Adrados 1979a, 30.

[161] Fontaine (1959, 177, n. 3) suggests that Isidore "a inversé une tradition scolaire conservée par un scoliaste d'Aphthonius" (II 8 Walz: ἔτι δὲ οἱ...Αἰσωπείους δὲ τοὺς ἐξ ἀλόγων καὶ λογικῶν συγκειμένους [*sc.* ἐκάλεσαν], ...Λιβυκοὺς τοὺς ἐκ μόνων ἀλόγων ζώων).

[162] See Van Dijk 1993c.

Conclusion

The Greek and Latin nouns referring to fables (especially λόγος, μῦθος, and *fabula*; less so αἶνος, *apologus*, and *fabella*) are polysemous (which is in itself relevant for the close connection of, or lack of distinction between, fables and other (sub)genres (notably proverbs, riddles, and myths)). The Greek terms say more about chronology—αἶνος being common in Archaic, λόγος in Classical, μῦθος from Hellenistic Greek literature onward[163]—than about contents, as they do as a rule not indicate different types of fables (nor do the Latin terms). It is true that μῦθος, when compared (or rather: in contrast) with λόγος, may have a connotation of fictitiousness (like *fabula* (and *fabella*)), or may refer to aetiological, or to verse, fables, but elsewhere the words (μῦθος and λόγος, *fabula* and *fabella*) seem mere synonyms. As a matter of fact, αἶνος is glossed with λόγος in Call. 20T11 (Choer.), and λόγος with μῦθος by Arist. 39T1a and d (anon. *in Rh.*)). One and the same fable may in the course of time even be referred to by three different terms: thus, Stesich. 7F2 is successively termed λόγος, αἶνος, and μῦθος (by 7T1 (Arist.), 7T3 (Conon), 7T5a (anon. *in Rh.*), respectively)!

Occasionally, other words refer to fables, but their occurrence is too sporadic to regard it as the use of terminology proper, although they are relevant to various aspects of the genre, viz. its comical function, its narrative and metaphorical character, its close relationship to proverbs, and its fictitiousness, the latter of which is apparent also from some composite derivatives of λόγος and μῦθος (some of whose special meanings are not, or inadequately, recorded in LSJ (nor in the *Rev. Suppl.*)). Likewise, the basic meaning of αἶνος is significant in connection with the use of fables as a veiled expression of opinion, its (incorrect) etymological derivation from παραίνεσις for the genre's persuasive function.

This polysemy is of course problematic (even more so because the terms are not always consistently used), but can be reduced by a connection with the name of Aesop, which is, however, not a termi-

[163] Cf. Ar. 17T27a (Σ)/17T50a (Tricl.), where V has λόγον λέγει, Lh (Taur) Ald πλάττει μῦθον. In *Praef. fab. Aes.* (*Aes.* T1) the use of the term is "intentionally antiquarian" according to Perry (1936, 171), contra Marc (1910, 411), who considered "λόγος und λογοποιός die Termini gerade der Rhetoren".

nological panacea in view of the heterogeneity of the materials involved (whether or not included in fable collections). Thus, mythological-aetiological tales are prominent among the oldest stories connected with Aesop. Furthermore, not only fables but also proverbs and riddles are traditionally associated with him (which in itself is significant for the close connection of these three (sub)genres). Fables may be connected with Aesop's name in various ways, which in general differ only formally, not as regards contents (although they occasionally may). Restrictions (in one way whatsoever) of the characters of fables connected either with Aesop's name or with some geographical adjunct are not only rightly opposed by some ancient testimonies (Theon G20c, Ps.-Diogenian. G28), but also not in accordance with the evidence extant (if any; whether or not in abundance).

> "Versuche, die stoffliche Vielfalt der antiken Fabel in einer Gattungsdefinition zu berücksichtigen, gibt es mehrere, aber am überzeugendsten ist immer noch die Definition, die wir bei den Rhetoren Theon und Aphthonios lesen..." (Holzberg 1993, 22)

1. *Comparison of Modern and Ancient Theory and Terminology*

Although, obviously, the aims and methods of modern and ancient theoreticians differ widely, and even though the information provided by the above study of fable theory and terminology is essentially disparate, some synthesizing remarks can be made, which may contribute to a definition of the genre.

Some positive conclusions may be drawn: the fictitious, narrative, and metaphorical character of the genre is stated by many modern and ancient theoreticians, nor contradicted by any, and apparent also from certain aspects of the terminology[1].

Other deductions which can be made are negative, but nevertheless consequential: the above theoretical and terminological study shows that neither the functions nor the characters of the genre should be restricted, the former type of restrictions merely generalizing one of the different functions mentioned in the theory or apparent from the terminology[2], and the latter type proving either untenable or artificial.

As for the genre's formal aspects, the explicit presence of promythia and/or epimythia should be considered optional. Their indispensability in the estimation of various modern and ancient theoreticians misunderstands their original function as general indications of a possible application of a particular fable in a concrete context (i.e. *outside* the collections).

---

[1] Fictitious: connotation of μῦθος, *fabula*, and *fabella*; πλάσμα; cf. derivatives εὑρεσίλογος, λογομυθοποιός, λογοπλάθος, λογοποιέω, λογοποιΐα, λογοποιός, ψευδολόγος, μυθοποιΐα, μυθοποιός, μυθουργία, μυθοπλαστής. Narrative: διήγημα, ἱστορία (*historia*), *apologus*, *narratio*; cf. *argumentum*. Metaphorical: παραβολή (*parabola*), *imago*, *similitudo*; cf. παράδειγμα, *argumentum*, *exemplum*.

[2] Persuasive: (incorrect) etymological derivation of αἶνος from παραίνεσις. Comical: ἄθυρμα, *iocus*, *neniae*; (incorrect) etymological derivation of αἶνος from ἰαίνω. Veiled expression of opinion: connotation of αἶνος.

Although, in principle, the length of fables is variable, too, many modern theoreticians emphasize that most fables are relatively short, with which one may compare the use of *brevi(ta)s* and *parvus* in Latin fable collections[3], and Mnesimachus' definition of Sybaritic fables (G4).

With the observation by some modern theoreticians that fable characters[4], as well as time and place of the action, are typically unspecified, one may connect a scholiast's testimony (G67a) that οὕτω(ς) is common in the *incipit* of fables. That the tradition of fables is both oral and literary is apparent from both theory and terminology[5].

As regards the proximity of fables and other genres, which is indicated by the very polysemy of the terminology and ultimately accounts for the seemingly endless theoretical discussion, the close (reciprocal) relationship of fable and proverb is emphasized in both modern and ancient theory and apparent also from the terminology[6], whereas comparisons, parables (Dithmar; Aug. G63), myths, and fairy tales are also compared with fables by theoreticians from both antiquity and modern times.

2. *Definition of the Genre*

In view of all this, one could, on the basis of the preceding theoretical and terminological examination, define a fable in just three words as a *fictitious, metaphorical narrative.* From this definition both characters and functions are conspicuously absent, as the former can be both rational and non-rational, and the latter may vary widely, notably from persuasive to moral-didactic, from satirical-comical to explanatory-illustrative, in accordance with the specific (pseudo-)historical or literary context in which the fable is employed. What the genre's

[3] *brevi(ta)s*: Phaedr. 1.10.3, 3.7.1, 3.10.60, 3.*epil*.7, 4.5.2; Rom. G74ab, 15, 92, 72 Thiele (*rec. gall.*); Rom. Angl. Cunct. *App.* 4; *Breviatae fabulae* (Hervieux II 246-261); Luther 12. *Parvus*: Phaedr. 1.15.3.

[4] Still in modern fables, e.g. Concepción Arenal, "Quién a quién" (*Fábulas en verso originales*, ed. García de Enterría, M.C., Madrid: Castalia 1994), 107-108; cf. e.g. [*quidam*] in Jac. Vitr. (*passim*); Jülicher 1910, I 97.

[5] Oral: αἶνος, λόγος, μῦθος, *fabula*, *fabella*; Aesop as narrator. Literary: μυθογράφος; Aesop (cf. Babrius) as writer, "in Aesop".

[6] αἶνος (incl. riddles; αἴνιγμα), λόγος, μῦθος, παροιμία (cf. ἀπόφθεγμα), Αἴσωπος (incl. riddles).

functions were in Archaic, Classical, and Hellenistic Greek literature will be examined in Part II below.

Nor does the above definition of the genre contain formal or structural elements like the presence of promythia or epimythia, since these are optional, or the size[7] of fables, for these may be relatively short but their length should not be determined too precisely. In practice, nevertheless, identification of (allusions to) fables may be facilitated by the occurrence of particular formal elements, notably unspecified protagonists (τις) and indefinite temporal and local adjuncts (ποτε)[8], as well as by the use of terminology, especially by a connection with the name of Aesop. None of these elements, however, is ubiquitous or exclusive. The same goes for the genre's basic dualistic, tripartite narrative structure (introductory sketch of the situation—action—concluding action or comment (*action/réplique finale*)), possible variations of which are legion[9], notably by omission of the introduction, or the appearance of a *survenant*[10].

On the other hand, the definition, concise though it is, helps to distinguish fable from other (sub)genres and forms of imagery (if not from parables): some of these (comparisons, similes, metaphors, proverbs) are not (past-tense[11]) stories; others (anecdotes, *exempla*, fairy tales, jokes) are not, or not in the same degree (less so: myths[12]; more so: allegories[13]), metaphorical; again others (descriptions of animal behaviour) neither. Thus the above definition is the basis not only of the Synopsis but also of the Appendix below.

---

[7] 25-30 verses on average, up to a maximum of 50, according to D'Ardène (E.-J.R., *Recueil de fables nouvelles*, 1747, 57; see Pascal 1995, 27); obviously shorter, however, than beast epic (cf. Lindner (above, Chapter I, 2.8)) and modern fiction of the type described by Blackham (ib. 2.9).

[8] For some examples, see the Final Conclusion below (with n. 4 (*quondam* etc.)). Cf. *aliquando* in Jac. Vitr. 63 Greven, Laur. Vall. *Fac. mor.* 16, Erasm. *Adag.* 1.4.18 (p. 188E), 17T64a, Pomey (1665, 10) (Ruelle 1986, 44); *olim* in Hor. *Ep.* 1.1.73, *S.* 2.6.79 (see Aug. G63); auct. inc. *Vir. Ill.* 18 2-4; Erasm. *Adag.*, p. 339E; Lorichius 1542, 20; Hes. 2T43 (Abst.); Pol. *Lam.*, p. 226 Del Lungo.

[9] See especially Adrados' *magnum opus* (1979a, 1985, 1987a).

[10] For the three French terms, see Nøjgaard's own definitions (above, Chapter I, 1.3).

[11] Including *praesens historicum*, of course. The occurrence of *aoristi gnomici* may be problematic in this respect; see, e.g., Van Dijk (1995b, 133, n. 8; 1996, 521) on *Vit. Aesop.* 37W, 88G, 125G.

[12] Allegorical reading of myths effaces this distinction; see Le Bossu, P.R., *Traité du Poème épique*, Paris: Le Petit 1675, 1.9: "Comparaison de la Fable de l'Iliade avec celle d'Esope"; Gaillard 1996, 86-88.

[13] But fables (like anything else) may be *interpreted* allegorically; cf. e.g. Pl. 49T3 (Iamb.).

The sporadic occurrence of more or less felicitously "fabulized" anomalous (particularly: non-narrative or non-fictional (or: not obviously fictitious)) items in the fable collections does not automatically imply that these and similar items are to be regarded as fables when occurring *outside* the collections.

The aetiologies included, or resembling those included, in the fable collections or otherwise connected with the name of Aesop remain problematic. Nevertheless, these are not to be excluded, as they not only traditionally but also structurally, thematically and functionally belong to the fable corpus.

The study of *allusions* to fables involves a theoretical problem *sui generis*. An allusion is here understood to be a more or less brief reference to a particular fable, which omits (or rather: purposely does *not* mention) some essential (greater or smaller) part of the story, the author apparently counting on his audience's knowledge of the full version.[14] This entails that it may be problematic to distinguish allusions from comparisons, similes, metaphors, and proverbs. This is the case not only because both the lost collections (see the General Introduction above) and the oral tradition of fables which might be alluded to are imponderables, but also, and more particularly, because the major distinguishing feature—viz. the narrative character—between these genres on the one hand and fables on the other is more, or even totally, implicit in allusions. However, it is typical of allusions that the elements left out (the "missing links", so to speak) are indispensable for a full understanding of the (thereby somewhat enigmatic) passages in question[15], whereas the other (sub)genres mentioned typically are, or can at least be assumed to have been, understandable in themselves.[16]

[14] Cf. Broich's "engeren Intertextualitätsbegriff" (1985, 31), according to which "ein Autor...von Rezipienten erwartet, daß er die[se] Beziehung zwischen seinem Text und anderen Texten als vom Autor intendiert und als wichtig für das Verständnis seines Textes erkennt."

[15] Cf. Riffaterre 1990, 56, on the readers' "awareness that an intertext [for this term, see the General Introduction above, n. 26] exists" when "they perceive that something is missing from the text".

[16] A clear example is Arist. 52A1 (q.v.). Counterexamples are to be found in the Appendix below.

PART TWO

THE FUNCTION OF FABLES IN ARCHAIC, CLASSICAL, AND HELLENISTIC GREEK LITERATURE

Non immerito...non solum Græci & Latini poetæ, vt Hesiodus & Horatius,...fabulas suis operibus inseruerunt, verum etiam maximi & celeberrimi Philosophi, vt Plato, Aristoteles, Plutarchus, & multi alii plurimum commendarunt, & ad institutionem moralis & ciuilis vitæ non minimum facere arbitrati sunt.

(Hes. 2T43 Pl. 49T14 Arist. 52T2 (Abst.))

1. *Points of Special Interest*

On the basis of the definition formulated in the preceding Synthesis, a corpus of Archaic, Classical, and Hellenistic Greek fables has been formed. This "fable collection", presented in the Synopsis below, is analysed in Part II and printed in Part III. More or less problematic passages which failed to meet our criteria have been relegated to the Appendix.

Each of the subsequent chapters diachronically discusses the functions of the fables and allusions to fables occurring in one literary genre. The analyses highlight various aspects of the interrelationships of the fables and their contexts, without neglecting problematic aspects (notably concerning the interpretation of fragments and the authentication of debatable ascriptions) or salient features of the fables themselves (especially when compared with other versions of the motif in question, or in view of the characteristics of the genre as such). At the forefront, however, are questions like these:

- how is the fable (or allusion) recognizable as such and/or demarcated from its context;[1]
- by and to whom, in what context and/or situation, on what (textual) level, why, and with what result or effect, is the fable told;
- what is/are the fable's function(s) in its micro- and/or macro-context;
- who or what is or are explicitly or implicitly compared to, or invited to identify with, what character(s) or element(s) of the fable, in what respect, and with what implications or connotations;
- to what extent are fable and context (made to be) analogous and/or interconnected, and from what devices or textual signals is the analogy apparent or to be deduced;

[1] Cf., in general, Broich (1985, 34), noting that "in den zahlreichen Arbeiten zur Intertextualität die Frage der Markierung bisher kaum behandelt worden [ist]".

- what is the function of possible incongruities between fable and context;
- do fable and context interact, and if so: how;
- what information on, or relevant to, any of these aspects is provided by the testimonies (if any);
- in the case of allusions: what is the exact relation between the allusion and the full version(s) of the fable?

The conclusions added to each chapter not only recapitulate the most remarkable aspects of the interrelationships between particular fables and their contexts, but also consider what answers to the above questions typify the author(s), genre, or period studied.

2. *A Note on Technical Terms*

It deserves mention that the general lack of attention paid to the fables occurring outside the collections indicated in the General Introduction above is apparent from the very absence of an established terminology, which might serve as an instrument to describe adequately various aspects of the interrelation of fables and their contexts. The following terms are more or less frequently used for devices or phenomena indicating or underlining the analogy between fable and context:

- verbal parallelism: identical or cognate words occurring in both the fable and its context[2];
- fable-context interaction[3]: an element belonging to the fable intruding into[4] its context, or *vice versa*[5];

---

[2] The same phenomenon may be observed in other forms of imagery, for instance in similes, e.g. Od. 4.335-340 (cf. the Appendix below): κρατερόφρονος ~ κρατεροῖο, εὐνῇ/εὐνηθῆναι ~ εὐνήν, τοῖσιν ἀεικέα πότμον ἐφῆκεν ~ κείνοισιν ἀεικέα πότμον ἐφήσει.

[3] Hassauer's use of this term is heterogeneous (see above, Chapter I.I, 2.11).

[4] Terms like "interfering" or "intersecting with" might have been used instead.

[5] For similar phenomena, see Silk's study (1974) of the interaction of tenor and vehicle in various forms of imagery (but not in fables). The terms "tenor" and "vehicle" were introduced by Richards (I.A., *The Philosophy of Rhetoric*, Oxford 1936 (partially reprinted (in a German translation by Smuda, M.) in Haverkamp, A. [Hrsg.], *Theorie der Metapher*, Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft 1996, 31-52)), to indicate the two constituent parts of a metaphor (cf. Fränkel's "Sostück" and "Wiestück" (H., *Die homerischen Gleichnisse*, Göttingen 1921, 4), "Sachteil" and "Bildteil" (see Dithmar (above, Chapter I, 2.5)), or the traditional *primum* and *secundum comparationis*).

- continuation of a fable's metaphor in its context[6]: a special case of interaction.

In addition, other terms have been coined to describe some "special effects" in the function of particular fables within their contexts, notably "para-fable" in Aristophanes, and "meta-fable" in Demades (41F1).[7] The exact meaning of these terms, which are only tentatively introduced, will, it is hoped, be fully clear from the contexts in which they are used.

[6] Cf. the continuation of similes, exemplified by Silk 1974, 18.

[7] Cf., e.g., the use of the same prefixes in "para-tragedy" (e.g. Rau 1967) and "meta-tragedy" (e.g. Latacz 1993, 299).

EPIC

ἀλλ' Ἡσιόδου μὲν ἐμοὶ δοκεῖ δικαιότερον Αἴσωπος αὐτὸν ἀποφαίνειν μαθητὴν ἢ Ἐπιμενίδης· τούτῳ γὰρ ἀρχὴν τῆς καλῆς ταύτης καὶ ποικίλης καὶ πολυγλώσσου σοφίας ὁ πρὸς τὴν ἀηδόνα λόγος τοῦ ἱέρακος παρέσχηκεν. (Hes. 2T4 (Plu.))

Videmus enim hoc docendi genere [sc. *fabularum*] *usos esse quondam grauissimos et sapientissimos homines...* (Hom. 1T6 Hes. 2T45 (Melanchthon))

Dignissimus autem honore tanto tantus Poëta [sc. *Hesiodus*], *qui preciosa diuini ingenii multa, ad omnium hominum vtilitatem spectantia reliquit monumenta, in quibus vt gemma nobilissima, relucet, quam de accipitre atque luscinia protulit, Fabula.* (Lorichius 1542, 26)

1. *Homer*

Theon (1T1; G20c)[1] and Philostratus (1T3; G43) mention Homer as the first fabulist. Nevertheless, neither *Iliad* nor *Odyssey* contains one single fable.[2] One cannot but speculate about the reason for the complete absence of fables from the Homeric epics[3] as well as for the listing of Homer among pre-Aesopic fabulists. However, certain similarities between (pseudo-)Homer and fables do exist.[4]

To begin with, Homer is the first author to have animals—Achilles' horses—talk,[5] as is observed by a scholiast (G36; Hes. 2T18), who

[1] Copied by Jo. Sard. and Doxap. (1T4-5; for the latter's text, see n. 30 below).

[2] Nevertheless, Schick (C., "Studi sui primordi della prosa greca", *AGI* 40, 1955, 92) asserts: "In Omero...sono state notate tracce di costruzione favolistica".

[3] Fables are often said to be inappropriate to the heroic epic because they are popular literature (Ludwich, A., *Die Homerische Batrachomachia...*, Leipzig: Teubner 1896, 5; Von Christ-Schmid-Stählin 1912, 668; Sinclair 1932, 25; cf. Fusillo 1988, 35; Crusius, 1913, p. IX (*contra*: Perry 1959, 23, n. 28, who thinks that Homer did not use fables because, rather, "he almost never speaks metaphorically" (likewise Blackham 1985, 5; *contra* (rightly): Nøjgaard (1964, 449), who himself holds (ib. 542) that "le caractère antireligieux de la fable explique l'absence dans *Homère*, poète courtois."); cf. Schadewaldt 1982, 42, 44-45); Hausrath 1918, 42. Davies (1987, 71) compares "his playing-down of stories and forms redolent of folk-tale"; cf. Griffin, J., "The Epic Cycle and the Uniqueness of Homer", *JHS* 97, 1977, 40.

[4] Cf. Jedrkiewicz 1989, 51, 305-306, 326 (n. 68).

[5] Il. 19.407-418. Huschke (1810, p. CCVIII, n. *) thinks this to be the reason that Homer is considered to be a fabulist; cf. Waltz 1906b, 9 n. 6, 119 n. 1.

compares the protagonists from Hesiod's and Archilochus' fables (2F1; 4F1) and Aesop, presumably because this partial anthropomorphization of animals is common in, though not exclusive to, fables.[6] What is important in this connection is that Homer is put on a par with fabulists.

Secondly, there are correspondences between fables and various Homeric similes (particularly those confronting prey and predator/raptor, or animals and men)[7]. A major difference is that fables are past-tense stories and similes are not.[8] The same applies to certain Homeric omens[9] and mythological descriptions[10]: correspondences with particular fables do exist, but the former lack the latter's narrative character.

Thirdly, in the *Odyssey*, Odysseus relates a story which Eumaeus terms αἶνος (14.508). Although the meaning of this term can be "fable" (see above, Chapter I.III, 1.1), this is not the case in the passage under consideration (as can already be deduced from Pseudo-Diogenianus (1T2; G28)), mainly because, unlike fables, Odysseus' story is not metaphorical.[11]

Fourthly, parallels[12] between the pseudo-Homeric *Batrachomyomachia* and the Aesopic fable of the Frog and the Mouse[13] show that the

[6] Cf. e.g. Wackers 1988; Ziolkowski 1993.

[7] Koep (1969, col. 141) calls these "Ansatze zur F[abel].dichtung"; Adrados 1979a, 207-210.

[8] See, e.g., the Appendix below on Od. 4.335-340 (17.126-131), and, in general, the Synthesis above.

[9] E.g. Il. 12.200-207 ~ *fab. aes.* 130 Hausrath (*Aes.* 128); Adrados 1978b, 44 and 1987a, 138-139 (contra: Nøjgaard 1964, 448); 1979a, 204-207. It is noteworthy that this omen is referred to in Aelian's paraphrase of a fable which Crates (60F/A1) said Stesichorus (7F1) sang of.

[10] Il. 24.527-533 ~ *Pa. Bodl.* 1 Chambry (*Aes.* 274); Hausrath 1909, col. 1706; Adrados 1987a, 281.

[11] See, in general, the Synthesis above; cf. Cope 1867, 255, n. 1. In spite of this, this αἶνος has, in the wake of Meuli (1954a, 739-742; see above, Chapter I.I, 1.1), been considered to be a fable by Perry (B.E., in his review of Meuli, *Gnomon* 29, 1957, 429-430; 1959, 23), Koep (1969, col. 140-141; contra: Nøjgaard 1964, 92; West 1984, 107), and Karadagli (1981, 9-11), whereas Odysseus' epithet πολύαινος has been interpreted as "fabelreich" (Meuli 1954a, 742; Koep *l.c.*; cf. Nagy 1979, 240, n. 1; but cf. Hes. 2T30c (Eust.) αἶνος παρὰ τοῖς παλαιοῖς οὐ μόνον ἔπαινος, ἐξ οὗ πολύαινος Ὀδυσσεύς, ...ἀλλὰ καὶ...).

[12] Frog drowning Mouse, Mouse cursing Frog; the epic starts like a fable (after a proem): 9 μῦς ποτε...; Wolke 1978, 91-178, 184-194; Glei 1984, 22, 116-117; Ziolkowski 1990a, 15; Merkle 1992, 120-121; Van Dijk 1995b, 145; cf. Nøjgaard 1964, 111; Fusillo 1988, 32, 89-90; Holzberg 1993, 21.

[13] *Vit. Aesop.* 133 GW (see Merkle 1992; Van Dijk 1996a, 530-541 *passim*), *fab. aes.* 302 Hausrath, Dos. 12, *Dod.* 246 Chambry, *Pa. Bodl.* ibid., Rom. 4 Thiele (*Aes.* 384).

former is based upon the latter.[14] However, the *Batrachomyomachia* is not a fable[15], but something different, a mock heroic epic, which makes use of the same material. Important deviations[16] from the Aesopic model speak against considering the author of the epic to allude to the fable.[17]

Finally, an iambic trimeter from another pseudo-Homeric poem, the *Margites*—"the fox knows many tricks, the hedgehog only one"[18]—, is interpreted by some scholars[19] to be part of, or to allude to, a fable. This suggestion meets with two objections. First, the fragment is perfectly understandable without such an assumption, namely as a double metaphor, taken from natural history, which became proverbial.[20] The line obviously does not fit in the only extant ancient fable with these protagonists[21], nor in a Medieval fable about a wolf and a hedgehog.[22] Moreover, the only fable which does correspond—although it is about a fox and a cat[23]—is not attested before the Middle Ages, which makes it more probable that this fable is based upon the fragment than *vice versa*.

---

[14] Not *vice versa*, as is stated by Adrados (1987a, 275) and suggested by Schwarzbaum (1979, 5).

[15] *Pace* Melanchthon (1T6), who draws a moral, Blackham (1985, 12) and Achelis (1913, 435), considering it to be a fable, respectively, "as parody", and "weil sie Tierfiguren an Stelle der Menschen in Szene setzt".

[16] Essential elements in the fable missing from the epic: the invitations to dinner, the rope, the deliberate diving of the frog, the bird of prey; Wölke 1978, 96-97, 113-114; Glei 1984, 116-117.

[17] Nor does the Hellenistic *Galeomyomachia* (*PMich. inv.* 6946); Schibli 1983, 11, n. 39; id. 1984.

[18] fr. 5 (= Archil. fr. 201) West *ap.* Zen. 5.68, Diogenian. 7.83, V 3.69, Plu. *Mor.* 971EF, Phot. *Lex.* sv πόλλ' οἶδ' ἀλώπηξ, *Suda* π 1931 Adler, Σ *in* Ar. *Eq.* 1068, Erasm. *Adag.* 1.4.18 (p. 187E); *Et. Gud.* sv ἐχῖνος (p. 574 De Stefani); Apostol. 14.60 (Arsen. 43.72); Greg. Cypr. M 4.98, V 3.44, Macar. 7.22; Σ *in* Lyc. *Alex.* 1093 *bis* (pp. 328-329 Scheer). Stanford (1942, 46) compares A. fr. 390 Radt *ap.* Stob. 3.3.11, Arsen. 42.18 (Apostol. 13.82a).

[19] Lasserre 1984, 61-63; Adrados (1987a, 291-292; but see 1955, 27, n. 2 and 1990, I 40, n. 2); cf. García Gual 1977, 120. See also the Appendix below, under Archil. fr. 201 West.

[20] Witness its inclusion in the paroemiographical collections; cf. Plu., Σ *in* Lyc. *bis*, *Et. Gud.*: παροιμία (full references given above, n. 18).

[21] Arist. 39F2; Plu. *Mor.* 790C (*Aes.* 427); cf. J. *AJ* 18.174-175 (6.5) (see above, Chapter I.I, n. 35). Lasserre 1984, 61, n. 1 contra West *ad* Archil. *l.c.*

[22] *Rom. angl. cunc.* 62 (*Aes.* 675; Adrados 1987a, 493). Contra Lasserre, *l.c.*

[23] Odo Cer. 39 (*Aes.* 605); other instances listed by Adrados (1987a, 560, to which one might add Erasm. *Adag.* 1.4.18 (p. 188E): *apologus, ab hoc proverbio non multum abludens*).

2. *Hesiod*

2F1 Hes. *Op.* 202-212[24]: Hawk and Nightingale (*Aes.* 4a)

The fable[25] of the Hawk[26] and the Nightingale[27] in Hesiod's *Works and Days* is the oldest one extant[28] in Greek literature. This fact, which can also be deduced from Quintilian (2T16b; G18b) and Plutarch (2T23b; G25b), explains at least part of the fable's renown both in antiquity and in more recent times. Ancient theoretical testimonies[29] frequently exemplify the genre of the fable by Hesiod's specimen, either by mentioning one of its characters or by quoting its *incipit*, whereas other testimonies[30] mention Hesiod as a pre-Aesopic fabulist. During the last decades Hesiod's fable has inspired more than a dozen papers.[31]

The fable relates "how the hawk[32] addressed the dapple-throat[33]

---

[24] Dalfen (1994/1995) takes 218 to be the end of the fable.

[25] The fable has, less accurately, been termed "Gleichnis" (Wilamowitz-Möllendorff, U. von, *Hesiodos Erga*, Berlin 1928 (1962²), 64; likewise Vandenberghe 1950, 27; Erbse 1993, 13, n. 5; Puelma 1995, 49; contra: Sellschopp 1934, 84; Perry 1959, 18), "allegory" (Forbes 1950, 84; cf. Reinhardt 1937 (?), 38-39), "Marchen" (Mader 1951, 45), "parable" (Fontenrose, J., "Work, Justice, and Hesiod's Five Ages", *CPh* 69, 1974, 14; Østerud 1976, 22; West 1978a, 49; likewise Puelma 1972, 98), "Ratselrede" (Sellschopp 1934, 86; Schmidt 1983, 55), whereas Fränkel (1976, 135) compares the fable with a political caricature, and Lonsdale (1989) suggests to read the fable as an omen (contra: Erbse 1993, 12-13).

[26] Neither a "Geier" (Josifović: 1961, 93) nor a "milan" (Nøjgaard 1964, 78; likewise Paley 1883, 3; Raddatz 1909, 31). Pannwitz (1966-1967, 58) prefers "Sperber" (likewise Duque de Medinaceli, *Fábulas de La Fontaine en prosa Castellana*, Madrid: Blass 1933, 10; Colonna *s.a.*, 73).

[27] Not "Taube" (Reinhardt 1937 (?), 38; likewise Fusillo 1988, 30), nor "alouette" (Nøjgaard 1964, 78).

[28] Duchemin's hesitation (1960a, 263) about this fact is unnecessary.

[29] 2T4, 2T6, 2T9, 2T11, 2T19-20, 2T26-27c, 2T29cd, 2T29f-30a, 2T38, 2T33, 2T35a, 2T36-37, 2T40-41 (Luc. Tarrh., Herenn Ph., Hermog., Jul., *Hypoth.* Isoc., Prisc., *Suda*, Doxap., Eust., Σ Il., *Et.Gud.*, *EM*, *Et.Sym.*, Zonar., Ps.-Ammon., Apostol.).

[30] 2T2-3a, 2T5, 2T10, 2T25, 2T27d (Quint., Plu., Theon (= Jo. Sard., Doxap. (αὐτὸν is to be corrected in αὐτοῦ!)), Philostr.

[31] McKay 1960, 1962; Daly 1961b; Ford 1965; Livrea 1970; Puelma 1972 (addenda: 1995, 48-50); Bonnafé 1983; Schmidt 1983; Isebaert 1988; Lonsdale 1989; Leclerc 1992; Dalfen 1994/1995; Hubbard 1995.

[32] 203 ἴρηξ; cf. Greg. Cor. (2T34); Neubner (1889, 8; Nøjgaard 1964, 449-450) deduced Ionian origin of the fable; contra (rightly): Livrea 1970, 14, n. 27.

[33] 203 ποικιλόδειρον. Ornithologists (but not Sauvage, A., *Étude de thèmes animaliers dans la poésie latine*, Bruxelles: Latomus 1975, 196) have noticed that this epithet suits a thrush (West 1978a, 206) or a swallow (Verdenius 1985, 119) better than a nightingale and might thus betray an earlier version of the fable. LSJ (cf. Thompson 1936, 17), however, equate ποικιλόδειρος with ποικιλόγηρυς; likewise Livrea (1970, 12):

nightingale as he carried her high in the clouds, grasping her in his claws; impaled on the curved talons, she was weeping piteously, but he addressed her sternly: 'Goodness, why are you screaming?[34] You are in the power of one much superior, and you will go whichever way I take you, singer though you are.[35] I will make you my dinner if I like, or let you go. He is a fool who seeks to compete against the stronger: he both loses the struggle and suffers injury on top of insult.'"[36]

The fable is clearly demarcated from its context by an introductory formula (202)[37], the use of terminology (202 αἶνος), and the device of ring composition (203 ὧδ' ἴρηξ προσέειπεν—212 ὣς ἔφατ' ...ἴρηξ)[38]. The fable deviates from the standard type in two respects: structurally, by the absence of an introductory sketch of the situation[39], and, as regards content, because neither is the stronger punished or put in his place, nor does the weaker try to escape.[40] This twofold anomaly has made the interpretation of Hesiod's fable problematic and controversial.[41] The function of the fable in its context is complex; careful analysis can reveal more than one level of meaning.

First, and most obviously, the fable about the nightingale in the

---

"certamente di canto", Pucci (1977, 77-78, n. 5), and Isebaert's suggestion (1988, 371) to take "δειρή 'gorge' comme image de la 'mélodie'". According to Mazon (1928, 93, n. 3), comparing Ov. *Met.* 6.669-670, ποικιλόδειρον refers to "les marques du meurtre d'Itys", which Philomela, when metamorphosed into a nightingale, "avait gardé sous le cou"; cf. Paley 1883, 32; Colonna, *s.a.* 136. Sinclair (1932, 25), referring to Ael. *NA* 12.28 and Arist. *HA* 9.49 (cf. Plin. *NH* 10.43.85; Clem. Al. *Paed.* 2.10.84), notes that "the nightingale changes the colour of her coat according to season." Van Lennep (1847, 49) offers another explanation: "neque certum est, ab Hesiodo per ἀηδόνα nobis vulgo notam lusciniam significari".

[34] Quoted by Eust. (2T29ab (cf. Van der Valk *ad loc.*), 30b).

[35] McKay 1960 detects an imitation of the sounds of both birds in the melody of this line (208).

[36] Translations in this section are by West, M.L., *Hesiod. Theogony and Works and Days*, Oxford/New York: Oxford UP 1988, 42-45.

[37] Curiously enough, Archibald (1912, 38) doubts the genuineness of this line.

[38] Cf. Nøjgaard 1964, 443.

[39] See the Synthesis above. Schmidt (1983, 68, 74) interprets its absence to represent the nightingale as innocent and the hawk as unjust.

[40] Cf. *fab. aes.* 4 Hausrath (*Aes.* 4, Hesiod's model according to Wienert (1925, 105, n. 2) and Puelma (1972, 86), but, conversely, modelled on Hesiod according to Adrados (discussion after Nøjgaard 1984, 245); Daly (1961b, 46; cf. Dalfen 1994/1995, 164) states that the two fables have "little in common"; Arnheim (1979/1980, 3) confuses the two fables; Lonsdale (1990, 23) confesses a *non liquet*); Rom. 55 Thiele (*Aes.* 567; cf. West 1978a, 205; Erbse 1993, 12). Adrados (1979a, 193-194; apparently unknown to Dalfen 1994/1995, 164) compares other fables.

[41] According to Mazon (1928, 77), however, the fable is "assez claire".

talons of the hawk can be interpreted as a metaphorical picture of Hesiod delivered to the kings' mercy. This interpretation (at least as old as Proclus (?; 2T17b)) recommends itself because, on the one hand, the nightingale (203 ἀηδόνα lit. "songstress") is a typical animal for poets[42] to identify with[43] and in the fable is called a "singer" (208 ἀοιδὸν[44]), like Hesiod[45]. On the other hand, this identification (of the nightingale and the poet) strongly suggests that the hawk represents the kings, who are explicitly addressed in the fable's introductory formula, and whom Hesiod elsewhere (39, 221) portrays as voracious (δωροφάγοι)[46]. As such, the fable links up closely with the preceding context[47], viz. the myth of the Five Races: it illustrates[48] the right of might (192) prevailing in the Iron Age, in which man will suffer pains (ἄλγεα[49] 200, 211; same metrical position) and "there

[42] And orators; see Salzmann 1910, 82, adducing, *inter alia*, E. *Παλαμήδης*, fr. 588 Nauck².

[43] B. 3.98; Ion, *AP* 7.44.3 (on Euripides); LSJ, *s.v.*; Chandler, A.R., "The Nightingale in Greek and Latin Poetry", *CJ* 30, 1934/1935, 78-84, 81; Stoneman 1976, 188; Steiner 1986, 105. Nevertheless, Schwarzbaum (1979, p. VI) equates the nightingale with "every citizen".

[44] Paley (1883, 32) notes "a remarkable reading in Cod. Gal. ἀηδόν' for ἀοιδὸν"; cf. the gloss *ad loc.* Sinclair (1932, 26) rightly declines Peppmuller's conjecture ἀοιδὸς (ἐοῦσα).

[45] *Th.* 22, 99, 104; cf. 95, *Op.* 26. See, e.g. Kerschensteiner, J., "Zu Aufbau und Gedankenführung von Hesiods Erga", *Hermes* 79, 1944, 173; Ford 1965, 4; Puelma 1972, 90; Fränkel 1976, 134; Østerud 1976, 22; García Gual 1977, 131; Pucci 1977, 62; Rowe 1978, 132; Karadagli 1981, 13; contra: Livrea 1970, 13; Rodgers 1971, 291, n. 2; Dalfen 1994/1995, 163; Hubbard 1995, 162-163, identifying the nightingale with Perses, and adducing (ib. 169) *Op.* 26sqq. Hesiod did probably not choose the nightingale for a (supposed) etymological reason; see Raddatz 1909, 31, n. *, contra Lisco.

[46] Puelma 1972, 90. Ziolkowski (1990a, 12-13; 1993, 8) asserts that Hesiod addresses "a vexatious tyrant".

[47] Cf. Van Groningen, B.A., "Hésiode et Perse", *Mededelingen der KNAW*, 20.6, 1957, 8-9; Diller, H., "Die dichterische Form von Hesiods Erga", *Abh. d. geistes- und sozialwissenschaftlichen Kl. d. Ak. d. Wiss. u. d. Lit. Mainz*, 1962.2, 62; Verdenius, W.J., "Aufbau und Absicht der Erga", in: *Hésiode et son influence*, Genève: Fondation Hardt 1962, 134; Østerud 1976, 21; Schwarzbaum 1979, p. VI; Adrados 1980, 75; Schmidt 1983, 76. Wade-Gery (H.T., "Hesiod", *Phoenix* 3, 1949, 90) and McKay (1960, 20) (contra: Livrea 1970, 15, n. 28), however, suggest to isolate the fable from its context. Likewise, Bona Quaglia (1973, 134) considers the fable "ermetico".

[48] Not: explains (contra Schmidt 1986, 96), let alone: endorses (contra Witte, B., "'Die Wahrheit durch ein Bild zu sagen.' Gellert als Fabeldichter", in: id. [Hrsg.], *'Ein Lehrer der ganzen Nation.' Leben und Werk Christian Furchtegott Gellerts*, Munchen: Fink 1990, 33). Cf., rather, Lorichium (1542, 28): "*A contrario*"; Barron, J.P.-Easterling, P.E., "Hesiod", in: Easterling-Knox 1989, 57.

[49] Bradford Welles 1967, 17.

will be no help against evil" (201). In the fable, the nightingale is indeed defenceless, whereas the hawk utters the *réplique finale*. Both the former's powerlessness and the latter's supremacy might at first sight seem inconsistent with the poem's manifest sense of justice. A closer reading, however, shows the example set by the hawk (like that by the drones later on) to be meant as *un*worthy of imitation.[50] In the first place, the fable proper contains various subtle clues guiding its evaluation: the sarcasm of the hawk is perverted and presumptuous; his talons are "curved" (205 γναμπτός), like (metaphorically) the Iron men's tales and the kings' verdicts (194, 221 σκολιός)[51]; moreover, eating frequently has a negative connotation in Hesiod[52]. Secondly, the fable introduces the *dike*-paraenesis (cf. Doxap. 2T27c πρὸς παραίνεσιν) in which Hesiod warns that violence brings total ruin whereas justice brings about prosperity. Finally, this paraenesis is closed by a passage which clearly corresponds[53] with the fable (by wording[54], position[55] and length[56]) but definitely opposes animals and men[57]:

"For this was the rule for men which Kronos' son laid down: whereas fish and beasts and flying birds would eat one another, because Right is not among them, to men he gave Right, which is much the best in practice." (276-280)

---

[50] Cf. Lorichium 1542, 28: "*A contrario*". Drones: 304-306; Bonnafé 1983, 261-262.

[51] See the analysis by Isebaert 1988, 374-375; cf. Waltz 1906b, 45; Lonsdale 1989, 410-411.

[52] West 1978a, 151; Leclerc 1992, 38-39.

[53] Mazon 1928, 74; Nestle 1942, 47; Solmsen 1949, 96, n. 83; Ford 1965, 8; Fuhrer 1967, 56; Østerud 1976, 22-23; Claus, D.B., "Defining Moral Terms in *Works and Days*", *TAPhA* 107, 1977, 75: "animal βίη as against human δίκη"; Renehan 1981, 255; Pleister 1988, 174. Erbse (1993, 14; like Ménard (referred to by Waltz 1906b, 120, n. 1); cf. Schmidt 1986, 36) even calls the passage the "Moral" of the fable; cf. Hes. 2T30c (Eust.) τὴν ἀξίωσιν..., τὸ μὴ δεῖν εἶναι θηριωδῶς τοὺς ἅρπαγας ἐπιφύεσθαι τῷ μουσολήπτῳ ἐκείνῳ ἀοιδῷ. Bona Quaglia (1973, 136; cf. Dalfen 1994/1995, 167) denies the correspondence: "sarebbe strano che il poeta sugerisse a Perse la spiegazione di una favola raccontata invece ai giudici". Skafte Jensen (1966, 21) objects that a fable is typically "a parallel to human life, not a contrast to it"; cf. West 1978a, 205; Lonsdale 1990, 23; Hubbard 1995, 163.

[54] 277-278 οἰωνοῖς πετεηνοῖς [Lonsdale 1989, 409] | ἔσθειν ἀλλήλους; 279 πολλὸν ἀρίστη ~ 207 πολλὸν ἀρείων (same metrical position).

[55] The two passages, preceding and closing the *dike*-paraenesis, are (again) connected by the device of ring composition.

[56] Isebaert 1988, 371.

[57] Ael. *NA* 6.50, however, critically observes that animals have more, and men less, sense of justice than Hesiod would have him believe.

The retrospective implication of this passage is that the hawk's (that is, the kings') behaviour should not be used as a model.

In addition to the interpretation given above, it is also possible to take the nightingale of the fable as representing Justice (δίκη). Both the nightingale and δίκη are violently carried along while crying loudly.[58] This second interpretation may cast new light on the expression δίκη ἐν χερσί (192) by which the right of might in the Iron Age[59] is summarized: the fable may be taken as a graphical illustration of δίκη ἐν χερσί: the nightingale in the hawk's talons. A possible objection that ἐν χερσί cannot be taken as referring to the talons of a hawk can be countered by a parallel from the very Aesopic fable which is most closely akin to Hesiod's, where the hawk actually calls the nightingale whom he carries along τὴν ἐν χερσὶν ἑτοίμην βοράν[60]. When interpreting Hesiod's nightingale as δίκη, it is difficult not to think of the hawk as representing its logical opposite, viz. ὕβρις[61], although this is not absolutely necessary. This interpretation closely connects the fable with the very next line, in which Hesiod addresses his brother: "But you, Perses, must hearken to Right and not promote violence."[62] A similar address immediately precedes the sequel to the fable quoted in the previous paragraph (274-275)—a perfect ring composition.[63] These two interpretations do not have to be exclusive[64]: a combination of both shows Hesiod to have justice on his side (and possibly the kings to have violence on theirs).

Even so, however, some difficulties remain. The hawk calls the nightingale a "fool" for "seeking to compete with the stronger",

[58] 208 ᾗ...ἄν...ἄγω (quoted by Hdn. and Choer. (2T7, 2T22a-d)) ~ 220 ᾗ κ'... ἄγωσι; 206 μύρετο ~ 222 κλαίουσα. Livrea 1970, 15; Bonnafé 1983, 263; Verdenius 1985, 128; Schmidt 1986, 102-103; contra: Bona Quaglia 1973, 136, n. 22 (quoted above, n. 53; however, Hesiod addresses both Perses and the kings (Nicolai 1964, 56); West (1978a, 50) points to 214 ἐσθλός as hinting at the kings). Pucci (1977, 66) adds 210 ἀντιφερίζειν ~ 223 κακὸν φέρουσα, which she (unconvincingly) interprets to show that both the nightingale and δίκη "fight[s] back".

[59] On Vernant's analysis of the "Weltaltermythos" in terms of Dike and Hybris, see Matthiessen, K., "Form und Funktion des Weltaltermythos bei Hesiod", in: Bowersock-Burkert-Putnam 1979, 29.

[60] I, II; τροφήν III; see above, n. 40.

[61] Livrea 1970, 14, inverting, however, the order of both interpretations. Likewise Dalfen 1994/1995; cf. Gagarin 1973, 90; Neitzel, H., *Homer-Rezeption bei Hesiod*, Bonn: Grundmann 1975, 57; Pucci 1977, 64; Dickie 1978, 99 (in general); Nagy 1979, 155; see, however, Puelma 1995, 48 contra Rodgers 1971, 289-293.

[62] Proclus (?; 2T171) observes this connection.

[63] Solmsen 1949, 96, n. 83; Gagarin 1973, 90; Rowe 1978, 133; West 1978a, 226.

[64] Contra Livrea 1970, 15; Bonnafé 1983, 264; Dalfen 1994/1995, 163.

which will deprive her of the "victory" (210-211)[65]. This seems to imply that it was the nightingale who somehow initiated the struggle. Unless one (with Aristarchus[66] (2T1 = 59A1)) athetizes these lines, which is too radical a solution, or (with Tzetzes (2T31a))[67] interprets them as *epimythium* in which Hesiod is speaking *in propria persona*, which is an illogical one (if only in view of 212), or (with Graevius) transposes them after 212, which is a doubtful one, or posits a preliminary singing contest (cf. Theon (2T3c))[68], which is an absurd one, or concludes that Hesiod could not think of another fable more appropriate to his ends[69], which is an unsatisfactory one, the precise function of the *réplique finale* in its context is problematic. One might conjecture that Hesiod presupposes acquaintance of his audience with some (lost) version of the corresponding Aesopic fable, in which the nightingale begs the hawk to hunt bigger birds instead and the hawk applies the *réplique finale* to himself ("I would be a fool...").[70] In this view, ἐλεόν (205)[71] could be considered to be a condensation of the nightingale's 'original' plea for mercy.[72] However, it seems more probable to assume that, conversely, the Aesopic fable 'normalizes' Hesiod's fable.[73] Moreover, the 'Aesopic' epimythium—"a bird in the hand..."[74]—is hardly applicable to the context of Hesiod's fable.[75] There is a way out of this aporia: the *dike*-paraenesis[76] introduced by the fable contains some significant inversions; these can provide a solution to the latter's problematic interpretation. "A man fashions ill

---

[65] Alluded to by Men. Prot. 2T21; quoted by Stob. 2T15, *Et. Gen.* 2T23b (adding a paraphrase); serving as point of departure for an argument to Nicol. 2T14. On ἀντιφερίζεις, cf. Hubbard 1995, 165-166.

[66] Likewise Rutherford 1883, p. XXVII; Waltz 1906b, 117; cf. Perry 1940, 400.

[67] Μέχρι τοῦδε ὡς ἀπὸ τῶν ὀρνέων ὁ ποιητὴς τοὺς λόγους ποιεῖται. Ἐντεῦθεν δὲ ἀναλαμβάνει τὸ ἴδιον πρόσωπον, καὶ λέγει τὸ ἐπιμύθιον, τοῦτο τὸ δίστιχον τοῖς κριταῖς.

[68] Daly 1961b; Jedrkiewicz 1989, 307; Dalfen 1994/1995, 171.

[69] Lasserre 1984, 83; likewise, West (1978a, 50) calls the fable an "unsatisfactory story"; contra (rightly): Dalfen 1994/1995, 164, n. 16.

[70] Aly 1921, 26; contra: West 1978a, 205; see above, n. 40.

[71] Quoted by *Epim. in Hom.* (2T24).

[72] Lasserre 1984, 83.

[73] Adrados 1987a, 36; Jedrkiewicz 1989, 307. Cf. Babr. 58 (*Aes.* 312) ~ Hes. *Op.* 90-104 (see the Appendix below).

[74] In spite of the applicability of this proverb to 40-41 (Gagarin, M., "Hesiod's Dispute with Perses", *TAPhA* 104, 1974, 110).

[75] Contra Schmidt 1983, 64.

[76] Bona Quaglia (1973, 140, n. 31; cf. Nicolai 1964, 53) considers only 248-273, the section in which Hesiod directly addresses the kings, to be "la risposta all' αἶνος".

for himself who fashions ill for another [like the hawk for the nightingale], and the ill design is most ill for the designer." (265-266) In the end, the wronger will be wronged. Thus, he who thinks to be smart (like the kings; 202 φρονέουσι[77]) will turn out to be stupid (like the nightingale; 210 ἄφρων[78] ~ 218 νήπιος): "The fool learns only by experience [like the nightingale]." (218) Thus, in view of these (paradoxical) connections between the kings and the nightingale, one could, in addition to (not: instead of[79]) the two interpretations discussed above, interpret the fable also as depicting the kings' punishment by the gods, particularly by Zeus (δίκη's father).[80] Therefore, in accordance with this (third) interpretation, it might be preferable to translate ἀρείων (207) and κρείσσονας (210) by "better", instead of "stronger".[81] Also, this interpretation does justice to several connections between the hawk and the gods, which do exist. First, both are omnipotent[82] and dwell high in the sky[83]. Secondly, the hawk occurs as an image of divinities in Homeric similes.[84] Thirdly, the last line of the fable may be significant for its interpretation: "So spoke the swift-flying hawk, the great winged bird". At first sight, the two epithets in this line (ὠκυπέτης, τανυσίπτερος) seem to be mere makeweights. Their use in Homer and Hesiod, however, may justify the deduction that they contribute to present the hawk as a divine instrument.[85]

---

[77] Either "although they are intelligent" (Pucci 1977, 61; Schmidt 1983, 55-56; Leclerc 1992, 37) or "who will understand it" (Livrea 1970, 8 (contra: Bona Quaglia 1973, 134, n. 16)); cf. Nagy 1979, 239, 313 (translating "aware as they are"); Schwarzbaum 1979, p. V; Dalfen 1994/1995, 161-163, 171-172. Some, not all (contra Livrea 1970, 6), testimonies (*Et.Gud.* Ps.-Ammon. Apostol. (2T33, 2T40-41), as well as *PBerol.* 21107, for which see Maehler, H., "Neue Fragmente eines Hesiodpapyrus in West-Berlin", *ZPE* 15, 1974, 199, 206) have νόεουσι (see West 1978a, 205-206).

[78] Leclerc (1992, 41) claims to be the first to point to the wordplay φρονέουσι ~ ἄφρων, but Livrea (1970, 7, 8 n. 15) already did the same, not to mention Bonnafé (1983, 264) and Isebaert (1988, 372).

[79] Contra Skafte Jensen 1966, 21 (contra: West 1978a, 206); Bradford Welles 1967, 19; Rodgers 1971, 291.

[80] On the relationship between δίκη and Zeus, see Gagarin 1973, 91.

[81] Bradford Welles 1967, 17; Leclerc 1992, 43. Schmidt (1983, 56) inconsistently renders ἀρείων by "Besserer" and κρείσσονας by "Stärkeren".

[82] 209 αἴ κ' ἐθέλω ~ 268 αἴ κ' ἐθέλησ'; cf. 667-669; West 1978a, 208; Leclerc 1992, 42. Schmidt (1983, 73) compares Il. 15.46.

[83] 204 ὕψι μαλ' ἐν νεφέεσσι ~ 18 ὑψίζυγος αἰθέρι.

[84] Il. 13.62 (Poseidon), 15.237 (Apollo), 18.616 (Thetis); Lonsdale 1989, 407, n. 26.

[85] ὠκυπέτης is the epithet of Zeus' (Il. 8.42) and Poseidon's (ib. 13.24) horses (Schmidt 1983, 56); Poseidon is compared to an ἴρηξ ὠκύπτερος (Il. 13.62). The eagle sent by Zeus to punish Prometheus is also called a τανυσίπτερος ὄρνις (same

Thus, Hesiod's ring composition is extremely functional: the end provides a clue. Finally, the interpretation of Hesiod's fable along these lines, as an unexpected change of roles[86], could be argued for by a surprising, though rather late, parallel, viz. an allusion by Eunapius (2T12), virtually the only one[87] to make a literary use of Hesiod's fable, which is to say, to incorporate it in a new context: the historiographer, while paraphrasing the *réplique finale* of the Hawk from Hesiod's fable, compares one Hierax, whose name obviously means "Hawk", to "Hesiod's Nightingale, unable to compete against the stronger"[88], one Herennianus, who is, in his turn, compared to an eagle; thus, we have a Hawk carried along by an Eagle like Hesiod's Nightingale.

3. *Nicander*

3F1 Nic. *Ther.* 343-358: Ass and Snake (*Aes.* 458)

In his *Theriaca*, Nicander relates how Zeus granted men Youth in reward for their report of Prometheus' theft of fire. They, however, inconsiderately loaded it onto an ass. The ass, dying of thirst, approached a snake who guarded a well and complied with his request to give him his load in exchange for a drink.

First, this "traditional fable"[89] is a triple[90] aetiology. It explains (1)

metrical position) by Hesiod (*Th.* 525; see Kretschmer, P.F., *De iteratis Hesiodeis*, Diss. Breslau: Schlesische Volkszeitung 1913, 54, 65); Leclerc 1992, 44; Dalfen 1994/1995, 174, n. 30; cf., however, Od. 5.65, 22.468.

[86] Cf. Nøjgaard 1964, 446: "le puissant est ainsi ingénieusement représenté à la fois par l'épervier et par le rossignol!"; Ford 1965, 8: "in the long run the nightingale will defeat the hawk."

[87] The great majority of the other allusions refer to Hesiod's fable merely to exemplify the genre, its antiquity, or for lexicographical or linguistic ends. It is uncertain whether Phot. *Bibl.* 77, 54a13-14 αὐτοῦ [*sc.* Εὐναπίου] τῶν λόγων...δέκα τοὺς ἱερακώδεις also refers to Eunapius' allusion.

[88] Translation by Blockley, R.C., *The Fragmentary Classicising Historians of the Later Roman Empire*, II, Liverpool: Cairns 1983, 119. Cf. Van Dijk 1993b, 34; 1994b, 131-132, nn. 148-156.

[89] 343 ὠγύγιος...μῦθος (παλαιὰ μυθολογία Σ *ad loc.* (3T1c)). Crusius 1916, 394 (on S. 14T1): "Märchen"; Gow-Scholfield 1953, 176: "legend"; Effe 1974, 57: "Mythos"; Karadagli (1981, 145, 147) wavers between "Fabel", "Mär", and "Mythus".

[90] Quintuple, counting also the aetiologies devised by a scholion (3T1a: the fable explains why the snake moves on slowly) and Davies (1987, 70): "the reason why men to this day treat the ass as a beast of burden to be weighed down and beaten with sticks is because of his original crime against mankind".

why snakes can shake off old age, (2) why men cannot[91], and (3) why the snake is called διψάς[92]: the snake inherited an unquenchable thirst (δίψη) from the ass. It is primarily, not solely[93], for the sake of the third aetiology that Nicander inserts this fable. The fable is thus connected with the preceding description of the διψάς and the lethal effect of its bite (334-342). Verbal parallels underline this connection between the fable and its context.[94] The first aetiology is based upon the ambiguity of the Greek γῆρας, meaning both "old age" (356) and "cast skin, slough of a serpent"[95] (31, circumscribed in 355 γηραλέον...φλόον; cf. Σ *ad loc.* (3T1k)). There might be an additional *jeu de mots* with γῆρας and γέρας ("gift"; replaced with its synonym δῶρον in 350 and 354), both in the juxtaposition of νεότητα γέρας (346 "Youth as a gift") and in the contrast between the initial and final situation of the story: mankind was granted γέρας (346) but got γῆρας (356)—a fine distinction linguistically but a world of difference in reality!

An outstanding feature of this fable is *kenning*.[96] None of its characters is mentioned directly, but all are circumscribed: Zeus by "Cronus' oldest blood" (344 Κρόνου πρεσβίστατον αἷμα); men by "those of full bodily strength" (343 αἰζηοῖσι) and "those who last but one day" (346 ἠμερίοισι); Prometheus by "the robber of fire" (347 πυρὸς ληίστορ'; cf. τὴν κλοπὴν τοῦ πυρός Eutecn. (3T2)); the ass by "the one with the white skin" (349 λεπάργῳ; explained by Σ *ad loc.*, *Et. Gen.* (3T1i, 3T3)) and "the brayer" (357 βρωμήτορος); and the snake by "the deadly, trailing brute" (351-352 ὁλκήρεα θῆρα | οὐλοὸν, 357 οὐλομένη θήρ). Even the action is concealed: from "<the ass> implored <the snake> to aid him in his sore plight"[97] (352) the reader

[91] Meuli (1954a, 736, 750-751), Kraus (W., "Prometheus", *RE* 23.1, Stuttgart: Druckenmüller, col. 666), Karadagli (1981, 147), and Davies 1987 compare aetiologies from different cultures, to which one from Sierra Leone (in: Itayemi, P.-Gurrey, P., *Folk Tales and Fables*, London: Penguin 1953, 121: "Why the snake can shed its skin") may be added.

[92] LSJ sv: "venomous snake, whose bite caused intense thirst".

[93] As suggested by Schneider, H., *Vergleichende Untersuchungen zur sprachlichen Struktur der beiden erhaltenen Lehrgedichte des Nikander von Kolophon*, Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz 1962, 98.

[94] f. 350 κεκαυμένος...δίψη ~ c. 338-339 καύσῳ | ...δίψης; f. 357 ἀζαλέην ~ c. 339 ἀζαλέης.

[95] LSJ, sv; cf. the wordplay in Ar. *Lys.* 364, 670, *Pax* 336.

[96] See in general Wærn 1951, who, however, mentions (44) only λέπαργος in Nicander.

[97] Translation by Gow-Scholfield 1953, 51.

has to deduce that the snake guards a well from which the ass wants to drink. What is more, the poet has hidden his own name in an acrostic (345-353 ΝΙΚΑΝΔΡΟΣ).[98] The *kenningar*, especially those of the ass and the snake, "imitate the picturesque tone of the fable".[99] The scholiasts' paraphrases (3T1ab, 3T2), however, substitute all *kenningar* by their solutions.[100]

The fable of the ass and the snake is connected with the rivalry between Prometheus and Zeus. The mythical introduction obviously has a causal function: it represents Zeus' gift as a reward for man's report of Prometheus' theft of fire. However, this link is significant in several other respects. First, similar aetiologies in other cultures have a comparable connection between the coming of civilization and man's loss of immortality.[101] Secondly, Prometheus and/or Zeus are typical characters in fables.[102] Thirdly, the fable thus gets a moral overtone: Zeus' gift in reward for the cowardly betrayal of Prometheus' theft is of no avail to mankind. This is formulated precisely between the mythical introduction and the fable proper, and thus functions as the fable's promythium: "The fools, they got no good of their imprudence".[103] Finally, there might be a connection between the *fire* stolen from heaven and the *burning* thirst which vexes the ass and, ultimately, those bitten by the snake. Thus, Zeus' gift proves to be a malicious punishment: fire seemed to be a blessing to mankind but will cause its death. The *kenning* of Prometheus as "the robber of fire", as well as three metaphors describing the thirst in terms of

---

[98] Discovered by Lobel, E., "Nicander's Signature", *CQ* 22, 1928, 114, comparing a less successful attempt in *Alex.* 266-274; cf. Bulloch 1989, 63.

[99] Wærn 1951, 46.

[100] Like (partly) Gow-Scholfield's (1953, 51-53) and (wholly) Karadagli's (1981, 145-147) translations.

[101] Davies 1987, 74-75.

[102] An incomplete list: both Zeus and Prometheus occur in Call. 20F1, *Vit. Aesop.* 94G (*Aes.* 383), *fab. aes.* 102 (*Aes.* 100) and 228 Hausrath (*Aes.* 240). Prometheus occurs in Phaedr. 4.15-16 (*Aes.* 515ab), *App.* 5-6 (*Aes.* 535), Babr. 66 (*fab. aes.* 229 Hausrath (*Aes.* 266)), Ach. Tat. 2.21 (*fab. aes.* 292 (*Aes.* 259)), Them. *Or.* 32, 359d (Stob. 3.1.122 (*Aes.* 430)). Zeus occurs in *Vit. Aesop.* 33G (*Aes.* 385), 135-139GW (*fab. aes.* 3 (*Aes.* 3)), Plu. *Mor.* 609F (*Aes.* 462), D.Chr. 32.63-65 (cf. *Aes.* T4; see Van Dijk 1994a, 96, 110 n. 7), Babr. 56 (*Aes.* 364), 58 (*Aes.* 312), 68 (*Aes.* 104), 72 (*Aes.* 101), 127 (*Aes.* 313), 142 (*Aes.* 302), *Pa.Bodl.* 57 Chambry (*Aes.* 311), 137 (*Aes.* 274), Him. *Or.* 10.9 (*Aes.* 444), *fab. aes.* 8 (*Aes.* 8), 44 (*Aes.* 44), 108-111 (*Aes.* 106-109), 119 (*Aes.* 117), 172 (*Aes.* 163), 213 (*Aes.* 198), 248 (*Aes.* 221); Davies 1987, 75, n. 54; cf. Hausrath 1898, 318.

[103] 348. Translation by Gow-Scholfield 1953, 51. One scholium (3T1f) explains that men betrayed Prometheus because he had not given them eternal youth.

inflammation (338 ἐμφλέγεται, καύσῳ; 350 κεκαυμένος)[104], are in favour of this interpretation. All of these connections are lost in one paraphrase (3T1a) which omits Zeus and Prometheus (but adds a typically indefinite time and place adjunct: ποτε, εἴς τινα τόπον).[105]

In addition to its aetiological function(s), the fable has a double structural function: it closes the description of two snakes (σηπεδών, διψάς) which belong together—like the aetiological myth in 309-319 closes the description of the preceding couple (κεράστης, αἱμορροΐς)) —and demarcates a caesura between two major groups in Nicander's elaborate discussion of various snakes (cf. the fresh start in 359 Νῦν δ' ἄγε), which is rounded off by another aetiological myth (484-487)).[106] This structural function is indicated by the aforesaid acrostic and the ornamental character of the passage.[107]

Conclusion

Fables occur only in didactic, not in heroic epic. This might be connected with the genre's didactic function.

Neither *Iliad* nor *Odyssey* contains one single fable, although some testimonies proclaim Homer the genre's εὑρετής. The mock heroic *Batrachomyomachia* is based upon, but does not allude to, a Frog-Mouse fable.

Hesiod's fable is problematically anomalous and complex. It consists of three supplementary semantic levels. On the first level, the poet metaphorically represents himself (the context intruding into the fable) and his opponents, whose behaviour is condemned; the second level is more abstract, linking the fable with both the preceding and the following context; the third level puts the poet's opponents in their place, holding out to them the prospect of divine punishment.

Nicander's fable is characterized by *kenning*. It has a triple aetiological and a double structural function. The aetiology is based upon an ambiguous word (γῆρας) and perhaps upon a wordplay, too (γέρας); the structural importance of the passage is underlined by the author's acrostic signature.

---

[104] Cf. 347 πυρός.

[105] See Van Dijk 1994a, 105-106, 109, 114 n. 58.

[106] See Effe (1974, 57-58), whose analysis meets, however, with general criticism of Knoefel, P.-K.-Covi, M.C., *A Hellenistic Treatise on Animals (The Theriaca of Nicander of Colophon). A Contribution to the History of Toxicology*, Lewiston/Queenston/Lampeter: Mellen P 1991, 73.

[107] Gow-Scholfield 1953, 177.

LYRIC

Ὁ μῦθος ποιητῶν μὲν προῆλθε... (Aphth. G54)

4. *Archilochus*

4F1a-h Archil. fr. 174-181 West: Fox and Eagle (*Aes.* 1)
Various testimonies and two papyri have preserved fragments from a fable[1] in an epod[2] by Archilochus about a Fox[3] and an Eagle[4]. Although the fable is incomplete[5], it is clear from these fragments, as well as from a partial paraphrase by Atticus (4T13ab; *ap.* Eus. (4T17bc)), that Archilochus' fable was roughly similar to the first[6] fable of the prose collections, which has the same protagonists. A juxtaposition of this Aesopic fable may contribute to a tentative reconstruction of Archilochus' fragmentary fable: the anonymous prose

[1] Less apt qualifications: "Märchen" (Hausrath 1918, 43; cf. Mader 1951, 7); "parable" (Bossi 1990, 187).

[2] Combining iambic trimeters and dimeters.

[3] A snake in the Akkadian epic of Etana (translated by Dalley 1991, 190-200; cf. Levin, I., "Etana. Die keilschriftlichen Belege einer Erzählung. Zur Frühgeschichte von AaTh 537 (= AaTh 222B* + 313B). Eine textkritische Erörterung", *Fabula* 8, 1966, 8, 32-33; Burkert 1984, 112-113), the pedigree of Archilochus' fable (see Williams 1956, 70-73; Trencsényi-Waldapfel 1959b; Adrados 1964, 267-269 and 1989, 63; La Penna 1964, 28-36; Pugliarello 1973, 26-27, 41-42; Schwarzbaum 1979, 66-67; Baldi 1961, 381-384). Holzberg (1993, 16) asserts that Archilochus replaced the serpent with the fox because of the latter's "Fähigkeit zur Gegenwehr". However, the fox appeals to Zeus because of her ἀμηχανία; cf. 4T13a (Attic. *ap.* Eus. 4T17b) ἀδύνατον.

[4] Not "the crow" (contra Gagarin 1974, 190).

[5] Nevertheless, Schwarzbaum (1979, 65) calls Archilochus' fable "full-fledged".

[6] *Fab. aes.* 1 Hausrath; cf. *Pa.Bodl.* 3 Chambry (other versions are mentioned below, nn. 10 and 12). The leading position of this fable in the anonymous prose collections does not prove that the epod which contained Archilochus' fable was his first (contra Lasserre 1950, 28-29; Adrados 1955, 12; Cascajero 1991, 22), given the alphabetical arrangement of the fable collections (Ἀετὸς καὶ ἀλώπηξ). A stronger argument in this matter is the selection of fr. 172 by grammarians (e.g. Σ *in* Hermog. *Inv.* (7.820 Walz); Heph. *Poëm.* 7.2; Jo. Sicel. *in* Hermog. *Id.* (6.128 Walz)) to illustrate epodic metre (Adrados lc; Dover, K.J., review of Lasserre-Bonnard 1958, in: *Greek and the Greeks. Collected Papers*, I: *Language, Poetry, Drama*, Oxford/New York: Blackwell 1987 (first appeared in: *CR n.s.* 10, 1960), 123).

versions relate how an eagle and a fox became friends and decided to confirm this bond by building their nests close together, the former in the top of a tree, the latter in the brushwood underneath. However, when the fox was foraging, the eagle robbed her young and fed them to her own. The fox, upon returning, could do nothing but curse her disloyal but unreachable partner, who was not to escape punishment. For, shortly thereafter, the eagle took a smouldering entrail from a sacrificial goat to her nest; the dry twigs blazed up by a gust of wind[7]. The burnt eaglets fell onto the ground, where they were devoured by the fox before the eagle's very eyes.

It is certain that Archilochus' version of this fable deviates from the Aesopic version in several respects[8]: the eagle makes a nest on a rock[9], not in a tree, and Archilochus' fable has an important religious dimension[10] (fr. 177; 4F1d), which was lost in most later[11] versions. It is also clear that Archilochus' version does not correspond to Phaedrus', since the variations in the latter's version—the omission of the initial friendship, the fire set by the fox (to a tree, of course), the restoration of the young foxes—are incongruous to the purport of the former's.[12]

Disagreement exists, however, about the exact number and order of fragments belonging to Archilochus' fable.[13] The one thing certain

---

[7] Will (1969, 61) misinterprets its effect: "a strong wind...knocks the eagle's young to the ground."

[8] Cf. West 1974, 133; Adrados 1979a, 429-431 and 1987a, 33. Nevertheless, Lasserre (1984, 78) asserts: "...le développement de cette fable, dans l'épode, n'ajoute aucun élément important, malgré sa longueur [?], à la narration beaucoup plus courte [?] transmise par le recueil ésopique hellénistique [?]..." In view of the differences (and the incomplete transmission), it is misleading to insert Archilochean fragments into the Aesopic version, as is done by some (Crusius 1913, pp. XIIsq; Mader 1951, 45-46; Schnur 1978a, 38-41), as well as to use the latter as a paraphrase of the former, as is done by others (Schwarzbaum 1979, 65; Karadagli 1981, 13-14; Lasserre 1984, 92-93).

[9] Fr. 176.1: ὑψηλὸς πάγος; Attic. (4T13ab) *ap.* Eus. (4T17bc): τὸν ὑψηλὸν πάγον; cf. West's tentative suppletion in fr. 175.4: ἐφ' ὑψηλῷ π[άγῳ.

[10] It is noteworthy that some late versions of this fable (Synt. 24; *Syr.* XXV, 27, 78 Lefèvre) again add this religious dimension (Adrados 1987a, 33).

[11] Will (1969, 61) suggests that Aesop's version antedated Archilochus', but Σ *in* Ar. (4T24; G66b; see below, Ar. 17A3) already knew that it was the other way round.

[12] Phaedr. 1.28 (Rom. 16 Thiele); Adrados 1979a, 430.

[13] One may compare some modern reconstructions (to facilitate comparison, the numbers of all fragments have been adjusted to West's edition): Lasserre (1950, 38-45): 174-177+176+313-181.11-312+255-179+180; id. 1984, 92-94: 174-181-177-176-175-180. Adrados (1955, 16-19): 174-181-176-177-175-203-179+180 (slightly

is that fr. 174 (4F1a) comes first, since it contains a terminological demarcation (αἶνος[14]), an introductory formula, and the *incipit* of the fable proper: "a fox and an eagle made friends." Fr. 176 (4F1c)—"Do you see where that high rock is, rough and rugged? There he's sitting[15], scorning your struggling"—probably is a *monologue intérieur*[16] of the fox[17] upon finding her nest looted; she realizes bitterly that the eagle is beyond her reach. In fr. 177—"O Zeus, Father Zeus, yours is heaven's rule! You supervise the deeds of men, their crimes and villainies; you care as well about the beasts[18], and whether they are rough or just."[19]—the fox[20] probably calls upon Zeus[21] to punish the eagle. By having the fox point out that Zeus oversees "men's villainous deeds", Archilochus possibly has a sly dig at the addressee of his fable.[22] Although fr. 178 (4F1e?)—"Beware of the one with the black arse"—may hint at a particular variety of eagles[23], it is far from

---

differently id. 1990, I 36-39). Giannini (1958, 85-87): 174-175-203-329-176-178-177-179-181-fr. reconstructed from Attic. (4T13ab) *ap.* Eus. (4T17bc)-180. Treu (1959, 84-88): 174-179-176-181-177-175-180. Tarditi (1968, 154-159): 174-179-329-176-181-178-177-175-203-180.

[14] This cannot be translated by "'an old Märchen'", as Schwarzbaum (1979, 65) does.

[15] κάθηται. Adrados (1964, 269; 1990, I 37) adopts Meineke's conjecture κάθημαι (likewise: Rutherford 1883, p. XXXI; Crusius 1913, p. XII; Giannini 1958, 86, 92; Frankel 1976, 200) and takes the fragment to refer to the eagle scoffing at the powerlessness of the fox; Treu (1959, 232-233) deems this conjectural reading "unberechtigt".

[16] Mette 1961: "Selbstanrede". Lasserre (1984, 93) links fr. 176 with (and after) 177 and interprets *both* fragments to be part of the fox's prayer to Zeus; contra: West 1974, 133; Bossi 1990, 200-201.

[17] Treu (1959, 233), Campbell (1967, 159) and Kirkwood (1974, 46) posit a third animal addressing the fox; contra: West 1974, 133; Bossi 1990, 200.

[18] One may compare (and oppose) Hes. *Op.* 276-280 (see above, Hes. 2F1; Rodgers 1971, 300, n. 4; Dierauer 1977, 17; Van Rooijen-Dijkman 1984, 9), which is not to say that fr. 177 is "an elaborate reference" (Gagarin 1974, 190) to Hesiod. Renehan (1981, 256) questions the value of Archilochus' attribution of δίκη to animals.

[19] Burnett 1983, 63 (cf. 64, n. 32), printing (with West) Liebel's (or rather: Matthiae's; see Bossi 1990, 1990, 205) καὶ θεμιστά but translating the testimonies' κάθεμιστά (Clem.Al. Eus. Stob. (4T14, 4T17a, 4T21))! Pouilloux (J., "Eschyle, adaptateur d'Archiloque", *REA* 66, 1964, 287-290) points to an echo in A. *Pr.* 3-6 (which is of course not to say that Stobaeus is right in ascribing the fragment to Aeschylus).

[20] Not: the eagle (contra Adrados 1964, 269, but cf. ib. 278).

[21] Ξένιος according to West 1979, 1; Ὅρκιος according to Davies 1981, 249 (contra West lc); Previously, Adrados (1964, 274) had rightly combined both capacities: "Zeus, defensor del juramento y la hospitalidad".

[22] See below; cf. Dalfen 1990, 58 and 1994/1995, 169, n. 21.

[23] Porph. *in* Il. 24.315; Tz. *in* Lyc. 91 (cf. *H.* 5.81 (20)); cf. A. *A.* 115.

certain that this fragment belongs to this fable[24] or its context[25]; if it does, it is at least difficult to integrate it meaningfully. Both fr. 179 (4F1f)—"He brought a frightful meal and set it before his young"[26]— and fr. 180 (4F1g)—"A spark of fire in[27] it"[28]—in all probability refer to the sacrificial meat which the eagle brings to her young; this does not, however, automatically imply that the latter immediately follows upon the former[29]. A papyrus fragment (175; 4F1b)[30] may also belong to the description of this second meal[31] rather than the first meal[32] (the young foxes), especially in view of the word πυρός[33] *in margine*. The interpretation of another papyrus fragment (181; 4F1h) is un-

---

[24] Thus Giannini 1958, 93; Tarditi 1968, 157.

[25] Thus Adrados 1956b, 30-34 and 1990, I 39, n. 4; West 1974, 133 and 1979, 3. Contra: Fraenkel 1950, II 68; Treu 1959, 238; Davies 1981, 249. Lasserre (1984, 93) does not include the fragment under consideration in his reconstruction of the fable. According to Graves (1960, II 163, 166 n. 4), adducing Apollod. 2.6.3, *Suda* κ 1405 Adler, Σ *in* Luc. *Alex.* 4 (cf. Nonn. *in* Greg. Naz. *Or. 1 c. Jul.* (*PG* 36, 1005cd)), the fragment belongs to the mythical episode of Heracles capturing the Cercopes; cf. Bossi (F., "Note ad Archiloco", *MCr* 8-9, 1973-1974, 95-101; 1990, 191-196), arguing for a synthesis.

[26] Translation by Williams 1956, 73. Treu (1959, 235) interprets this fragment to refer to the eagle's *first* meal. Contra: Degani (1976, 25), pointing to κατακαῖον, a gloss to αἰηνές, under which heading fr. 179 is quoted by several etymological dictionaries (*Et. Gen.* B [see Calame, C., *Et. Gen.; les citations de poètes lyriques*, Roma: Ateneo 1970, 13], *EM*, *Et. Sym.* (4T29, 4T38, 4T40)); cf. Bossi 1990, 197. Lasserre (1984, 93) omits this fragment in his reconstruction of the fable (perhaps because of West's criticism (1982, 30) on his changement of position (Lasserre 1950, 44)). Giannini (1958, 93) assumes that "saranno parole della volpe che spiega a Zeus il misfatto di cui si è resa colpevole l'aquila."

[27] ἐν Schneidewin; ἦν Σ *in* Ar. (4T24); West *in app. crit.*.

[28] Translation by Williams, lc. Giannini (1958, 95), inspired by Phaedr. 1.28.8-9, asserts that "la volpe...appicca il fuoco alla legna che...ha accatastata".

[29] Contra Lasserre 1950, 44-45: "Ces deux vers, qui nous sont rapportés séparément par deux citateurs différents [!], doivent être réunis si on veut | que αὐτῷ ait un sens"; cf. Adrados 1955, 19 and 1990, I 39; Williams, lc; West *in app. crit. ad loc.* But αὐτῷ may refer to another word.

[30] *POxy.* 2315. The ascription to Archilochus is questioned by Medaglia 1982, 134.

[31] Mette 1961, 36; Lasserre, 1984, 93.

[32] Contra Adrados (1955, 18; 1990, I 38) and West (1974, 133), who argues: "The young eagles and the location of the nest are described circumstantially [?], as if this was the first mention of them."

[33] Disposed of somewhat too easily by Adrados (1955, 19; contra Lobel): "mi impresión es que no se trata de glosas o varias lecciones, sino de un texto independiente copiado a lado en época posterior"; by Giannini 1958, 89: "dove più tardi...le fiamme del fuoco...li fecero morire"; and by West 1974, 133: "The scholium, if it refers to the visible column of the text, may have been explaining that the νεοσσιή was of combustible material." See Bossi 1990, 198, pointing to the relevance of 3 ἀπτ]ῆνες.

clear, due to the lacunal state of the papyrus[34]. Three masculine participles ("mindful of"[35], "having drenched"[36], "path swiftly through the sky, curving its rapid wings"[37]) probably refer to the eagle, possibly coming to the rescue of his young.[38] It is unclear by whom and to whom the last words "but your mind hopes" are directed.[39] There is no indication about how exactly the fable ended.[40] Attempts to extend the number of fragments belonging to Archilochus' fable are highly speculative and unconvincing.[41]

Strictly speaking, the context of Archilochus' fable of the fox and the eagle has not been preserved. It is probable, however, that Archilochus used this fable in an epod against Lycambes[42], in view of, on the one hand, the testimony of Philostratus (4T16; G43)[43], who wit-

---

[34] *POxy.* 2316; Medaglia (1982, 134) opposes its ascription to Archilochus. Giannini's suppletions (1958, 87) are "a good example of wasted ingenuity" (Gerber, D.E., *Lustrum* 33, 1991, 28; cf. Luria 1961, 178).

[35] 8 μεμνημένος. Translation by West 1974, 134. Lobel's conjecture ὀρ]φανῶν, which is certainly not "seul possible à cet endroit", induces Lasserre (1984, 93) to make the improbable suggestion that "le mot 'orphelins'...indique peut-être qu'il [l'aigle] croyait le renard disparu pour toujours, ce qui pouvait excuser son geste [sc to rob the the young foxes]"—the eagle as a cruel foster mother!

[36] 9 κλύσας. Translation by West lc, who indulges in phantasies: "the eagle, having deposited the δεῖπνον αἰηνές and flown off again to fetch some water to go with it, returns to find its young roasted, is smitten with grief, but has the practical sense to let the water it is carrying fall upon the flames, before flying away to seek a new home." Contra: Carey 1986, 61, n. 10; Bossi 1990, 205-206.

[37] 10 κέ]λευθον ὠκέως δι' αἰθέρος 11 λαιψηρὰ κυ]κλώσας πτερά; suppleted with Attic. (4T13b) *ap.* Eus. (4T17c); Plu. *Mor.* 507A; ib. 750B. Translations by West lc.

[38] Differently (but unconvincingly) Giannini (1958, 89): "si parla dei timori dell' aquila che vede la volpe in sospettosi maneggi affacccendata e teme una vendetta".

[39] Treu 1959, 233: a third animal addressing the fox; Mette 1961, 35-36: "Selbstanrede" of the fox (contra: Fuhrer 1967, 7, n. 48); West 1974, 134: Archilochus addressing Lycambes; Lasserre 1984, 93: the eagle sneering at the fox; Carey 1986, 61, n. 10, is in doubt: "spoken by the eagle in exultation...or the fox in recrimination"; cf. Bossi 1990, 203.

[40] It is by no means certain that Archilochus' (like Aesop's) fox devoured the eaglets (contra Schadewaldt 1982, 43; Bossi 1990, 206).

[41] E.g. West *ad* fr. 224 (*ap.* Ath. 9.41, 388F) πτώσσουσαν ὥστε πέρδικα: "fort. de vulpis catula ab aquila correpta"; contra: Bossi 1990, 234-235, joining Monti, A.M., *De Archilochi elocutione*, Augustae Taurinorum 1907, 66, but, in his turn, commenting (ib. 259) upon fr. 313 West: "da collocare, con ogni probabilità, accanto al fr. 178 [for which see above, nn. 23-25]".

[42] On the relevance of the name, see West 1974, 26; Nagy 1979, 251; Ziolkowski 1993, 151.

[43] Misinterpreted by Steffen 1952-1953, 32: "...apologo de aquila et vulpe tractante, quem apologum contra Lycamben scriptum esse testificatur Philostratus." Huschke (1810, pp. CCXIVsqq) was the first to connect *this* fable with the epod.

nesses that Archilochus used a fable against Lycambes, and, on the other hand, the fact that two fragments (172, 173) clearly dealing with Lycambes[44] have the same epodic metre and theme[45] as the fable of the eagle and the fox: "Father Lycambes, what was this plan of yours? Your wits were sound; who's fuddled them? You're going to be a joke around this town"[46], and: "You have renounced the great oath made by salt and table"[47]. The former fragment was probably the epod's *incipit*; the latter may have preceded[48] or followed[49] the fable. Both fragments are in accordance with, and may even have inspired, a widespread ancient tradition[50], which has it that Lycambes had promised his daughter to Archilochus but later on broke his pledge, whereupon the poet haunted his former future father-in-law and wife with lampoons so bitter and implacable that they finally hanged themselves[51].

In spite of the numerous uncertainties in the reconstruction and interpretation of the extant fragments of the fable, it is clear that the situation of the fox and the eagle is analogous[52] to that of Archilochus and Lycambes: both the eagle and Lycambes broke faith with the fox and Archilochus, respectively.[53] The function within Archilochus'

---

[44] Fr. 172 (quoted by Demetr. *Eloc.* 5) is self-explanatory. For fr. 173, see Origen, *Cels.* 2.21 and D.Chr. 74.16; Carey 1986, 61.

[45] Carey 1986, 61, n. 9 (contra Latte 1964, 387, n. 2 (quoted below, n. 53); cf. Adrados 1955, 12-13.

[46] Translation by Burnett 1983, 61.

[47] Translation by Williams (1956, 73), who thinks (like Irmscher 1987, 5) that these lines are spoken by the fox to the eagle, rather than by Archilochus to Lycambes. Origen, *Cels.* 2.21 and D.Chr. 74.16 militate against this interpretation. Will's translation (1969, 61) is incorrect.

[48] West in his edition.

[49] Will 1969, 61.

[50] Pseudacr. *in* Hor. *C.* 6.11; ib. *Ep.* 1.19.25sqq (p. 495 H.); Porph. ibid.30-31 (p. 500 H.); Σ *in* Ov. *Ib.* 54, 521; Σ *in* Heph. p. 281 Consbruch; *AP* 7.69-71 (Jul. (Aegypt.), Gaet.); Carey 1986, 60, n. 1. A different but "interesting approach" (Barron-Easterling 1989, 83) is made by West 1974, 27.

[51] Grubmuller (1983, 479) gives too much credence to this legend, when they consider Archilochus' "Invektiven" to be "ein makabrer Beleg von (Fabel-)Literatur im Wirkungszusammenhang."

[52] Three words seem to occur in the same case in both fable and context: φρένας (fr. 172.2 and 181.5 φ]ρέ[ν]ας), ἀνθρώπων (fr. 174.1 and 177.2), πάτερ (fr. 172.1 and 177.1), but it is difficult to say whether or not these parallels are significant, in view of the fragmentary tradition of the epod.

[53] Cf. Van Rooijen-Dijkman 1984, 9; Carey 1986, 61. Latte (1964, 387, n. 2; incorrectly, but with approval, quoted by Burnett 1983, 64, n. 32) hypercritically looks for perfect parallelism (without avail): "Die Fabel wäre schlecht gewählt, da Lykambes dem Archilochos nichts geraubt, sondern nur etwas nicht gegeben hatte."

epod against Lycambes is probably to impress upon Lycambes that a perjurer cannot evade being brought to justice, even if he thinks himself safe from his deceived partner's revenge, for Zeus sanctions the retribution. Archilochus probably warns Lycambes that he will no doubt be punished.[54]

4F2a-c Archil. fr. 185-187 West: Ape and Fox (*Aes.* 81)

From fr. 185 (4F2a) it is certain that Archilochus used yet another fable, about an ape and a fox[55], in another epod[56]:

"I'll tell you a fable, Kèrykidès, a sad message-stick[57]"; "An ape, separated from[58] the other beasts, went alone into the wilderness; there a wily[59] fox met him, with a shrewd mind".

The first quotation is the typical[60] introduction of the fable, which is also demarcated from its context by a terminological indication (αἶνος); the second one probably forms the fable's *incipit*. The fact

---

[54] Cf. Rogers 1906, 85; Van Rooijen-Dijkman l.c. Carey (1986, 61-62) deems actual rather than future punishment "more likely, since in Aesop's version...the fox has the pleasure of eating the eagle's young". But, on the one hand, fables commonly depict the inevitable consequences of some proposed line of conduct (but cf. below, Arist. 39F2); on the other hand, the solemnity of the invocation of Zeus in fr. 177 makes more sense if it is interpreted as an indirect threat.

[55] Not a lion (contra Dalfen 1990, 57).

[56] Combining iambic trimeters and dactylic *hemiepes*.

[57] ἀχνυμένη σκυτάλη (thus Adrados 1955, 50; Treu 1959, 228; Tarditi 1968, 164; Campbell 1983, 130), nominative to ἐρέω, not vocative to Κηρυκίδη (Lasserre, F., "Lettres et poésie écrite chez Archiloque", in: Bádenas de la Peña *et al.* 1987, 501; cf. LSJ sv σκυτάλη: "dub. sens."; Page 1964, 142); West (M.L., followed by Bossi 1990, 210) reads ἀχνυμένῃ σκυτάλῃ (contra: West (S.) 1988, 47).

[58] ἀποκριθείς (changed by Buchholtz (1873, 178) into ἀρχὸς κριθείς because it "vor dem folgenden μοῦνος eine unertragliche Wiederholung giebt [cf. Nøjgaard 1964, 453] und das wichtige weglasst: er war zum Herrscher der Thiere erwahlt". West rightly opposes Lasserre (1984, 79, 103 (discussion)), who, in the wake of Luria (1930), "argues ingeniously from the aorist participle ἀποκριθείς that this was a kind of continuation of a story told in a previous poem. I find this difficult to reconcile with the introductory words ἐρέω τιν' ὕμιν αἶνον—just 'a story' (...). Normally every fable is completely self-contained."

[59] κερδαλέη. Pl. 49A2 (= 4T1), D.Chr. 4T7 and Bas. 4T18-19 probably (and D.Chr. 4T6, Hermog. G41 (4T15) and Prisc. G70 (4T22) possibly; cf. *AG* 1.276 Bachmann, Phot. *Lex.* 157, Hsch. κ 2307 Latte, *Sudam* κ 1382 Adler; Bossi 1990, 210) allude to *this* Archilochean fox fable; cf. Huschke 1810, pp. CCXXVIIIsq. Adam 1963, I 84: "Archilochos seems to have canonized the fox as the embodiment of cunning in Greek literature." Cf. Diez-Bauer 1973, 170; García Gual 1970, 419; Lehnemann, W., "Vom schlauen Fuchs. Ein Beitrag zur Wirkungsgeschichte eines Motivkomplexes", in: Bianciotto 1984, 308.

[60] ἐρέω τιν' ὕμιν αἶνον. Cf. Hes. 2F1.202; Archil. 4F1a.1; Nøjgaard 1964, 443, 451; Page 1964, 142; Burnett 1983, 62.

that all testimonies which preserve these two quotations separate them by εἶτα ἐπιφέρει does not prove that they do not belong closely together[61], for these references serve to illustrate the use of αἶνος as a term for "beast fable". Αἶνος does occur in the first part, but only from the second part it is apparent that the term refers to a fable with animal characters.[62] Fr. 187 (4F2c)—"Oh ape, with such a backside as you have"—in all probability belongs to the same fable[63] and contains a clue for its reconstruction. For the anonymous prose fable collections give an expurgated version of this fragment. The Aesopic fable[64] relates how an assembly of the beasts elected an ape king because of his dancing. A jealous fox took him to a trap which contained a piece of meat, and pretended to offer it as a gift to His Royal Highness. The ape unsuspectingly raised to the bait. When the ape protested, the fox replied: "Oh ape, with such a fate[65] as you have you are king of the beasts?" This "désexualisation"[66] obviously is less to the point[67] than the unexpurgated version: the ape, caught in the trap, displays his posterior which, probably[68] for lacking

---

[61] Contra Luria (1930 and 1934, 453, n. 1). Cf. Immisch 1930-1931, 3.

[62] Luc. Tarrh., Herenn. Ph., Eust., Ps.-Ammon., Σ *in* Il. (4T5ab, 4T9ab, 4T37ab, 4T44ab, 4T48ab); Immisch 1930-1931, 4.

[63] Cf. Σ *in* Ar. (4T23; G66b): ἐκ τῶν Ἀρχιλόχου ἐπ(ῳδ)ῶν. Contra: Adrados 1955, 46; 1990, I 47.

[64] 83 Hausrath (*Aes.* 81).

[65] τύχην Pb Pc Mb Ce Cf (τύχην μωρὰν Ma, μωρὰν (μοῖραν Ca) τύχην e.g. Mc Ca, μοίρας καὶ τύχης Mh). *Variae lectiones* (using Chambry's symbols): μωρίαν e.g. Pf La Me (preferred by Chambry (38); not in Archilochus (contra Schwarzbaum 1979, 146, n. 12)), στοιχεῖν Pa, κουφότητα Mk. Both Hausrath (83) and Perry (81) adopt Schneidewin's (I.G., *Fabulae Aesopiae e codice Augustano nunc primum editae cum fabulis Babrii choliambicis collectis omnibus...*, Breslau: Korn 1812, 178) emendation ψυχήν, although Nøjgaard (1964, 524) rightly objects that "elle confère un sens au texte 'corrompu', mais le 'sens' du texte d'*augustana* est précisément d'être dépouillé d'un sens logique!"

[66] Nøjgaard lc.

[67] Dumont (1989, 16) exaggerates: *Pygèn* est devenu *tychèn*, ce qui ne veut rien dire".

[68] Three different explanations: McDermott (1935, 171), pointing to Semon. 7.76 (ἄπυγος) and Arist. *HA* 2.8 (οὔτ' ἰσχία ἔχει): "the ape has no rump". Immisch (1930-1931, 7), pointing to Phaedr. *App.* 1.2 (inappropriately) and Rom. 57 (*leg.* 67) Thiele (*Aes.* 533): *nates suas turpissimas* [rec. vetus]/*turpitudinem natium suarum* [rec. gall.]: "die partie honteuse des Affen..., in seiner Bloße ein widerlicher Anblick, namentlich bei den mit einer sogenannten Gesäßschwiele ausgetatteten Arten, welche Schwiele nach Farbe und Form bis ins Monstrose gehen...kann". Luria (1930, 7-8, 15) thinks that the ape is stigmatized by the ῥόπτρον. Contra: Immisch lc, who proposes to change (ib. 10) πύγην into τύλην (likewise (ib. 14) in Babr. 81.1 instead of στήλην) (contra (rightly): Adrados 1955, 44; Luria 1934, 451-452 and 1961, 192).

hairs[69], is derided by the fox as being incongruent with his high position. The almost verbatim correspondence between the *réplique finale* of the Aesopic fable and the above fragment from Archilochus legitimates the deduction that the latter's fable was more or less similar to the former.[70] Fr. 186 (4F2b)—"knocking into the trap[71]"—can plausibly be assumed to belong to the same fable.[72] Other fragments, however, cannot.[73]

The only trace of the context of this fable is its introduction. Apparently[74], Archilochus applies the fable to the addressee, Kèrukidès[75]. Obviously, the "sad message-stick" is a pun[76] on this patro-

---

69 Denis 1883, 230; Adrados 1955, 46; Lasserre 1984, 75, comparing French "poilu"; cf. μελάμπυγος, πύγαργος; Ar. *Ach.* 119: πρωκτὸν ἐξυρημένε; Phaedr. *App.* 1.2: *nudas nates*. Differently Dressel's tentative explanation (1876, 20) that "πυγή den Alten Sitz des Verstandes war".

70 Some scholars, however, identify Archilochus' fable with *Aes.* 14 (Babr. 81; *fab. aes.* 14 Hausrath) (Werner 1892, 7-8; Klinger 1948-1949, 46; Schwarzbaum 1979, 339). Others think that Archilochus combined in one epod, or inserted into two consecutive epods (Adrados 1955, 42-52 and 1990, I 46-48), both *Aes.* 81 and 14 (Lenz 1945, 45, pointing to the plural 'Αρχιλόχου πίθηκοι in an allusion by Aristides (4T11; *ap.* Phot. (4T30)), which is a false argument (cf. Immisch 1930-1931, 7; Lasserre 1950, 111) because Aristides may be simply adjusting the image to his context: calling his opponents as a body "Archilochus' apes" is perhaps equivalent to comparing them one by one to "Archilochus' ape"); Lasserre 1950). Luria (1930, 14-15) even believes in a sequence of six fables in one epod: *Aes.* 20, 81, 83, 220, 345, 463 (*fab. aes.* 20, 83, 85, 246 Hausrath, Babr. 130, Luc. *Pisc.* 36 (cf. Bahntje, U., *Quaestiones Archilocheae*, Diss. Göttingen 1900, 39 contra Crusius, who proposed to read ἀντ' ἰτρίων instead of ἀντὶ τριῶν in Aristid. lc), respectively)! Boulenger (*ad* Bas. (4T18)), on the other hand, is overcautious: "on manque de précisions".

71 ῥόπτρῳ ἐρειδόμενον (*ap. EM* (4T39); cf. Σ *in* Ar. *Ach.* 687, *Suda* σ 534 Adler), misinterpreted by Klinger (1948-1949, 46) to refer to the ape taking the walking cane of the fox "tamquam suo ipsius nobili generi respondentem". Immisch (1930-1931, 5) relegates this fragment to *Aes.* 345 (Babr. 130), "die auch irgendwo bei Archilochos vorkam".

72 Contra: Adrados 1955, 46; 1990, I 47.

73 Contra West *ad* fr. 225 (*ap.* Ath. 14.68, 653D) πάρελθε, γενναῖος γάρ εἰς: "si est trimetri pars, fort. vulpes simium regem iubet occupare thesaurum"; Lasserre (1950, 112-133; id.-Bonnard 1958, 64-66), connecting (fragment numbers adjusted to West's edition) 185-184-264-248-311-273-232-266-186-187); Adrados (1955, 50; 1990, I 48 (contra Lasserre)): 185-264-248.

74 Some think that Archilochus is again attacking Lycambes (Huschke 1810; Will 1969, 61), while he addresses "Cerycidae, amico suo" (Klinger 1948-1949, 45; cf. Barron-Easterling 1989, 86).

75 Σ *in* Il. (4T48a) has Κηρυδίκη.

76 Cf. Treu 1959, 228; Silk 1974, 153 ("extra-grammatical preparation"); West (S.) 1988, 47.

nymic—"Messenger's son"—, which may be fictitious[77]; its exact meaning, however, is much debated, already from antiquity.[78] It probably announces the unpleasant message[79] the poet conveys in an indirect way, as fables do[80]. The fable may portray Kèrukidès, Archilochus and, possibly, his friends in the ape, the fox and the animals, respectively. The context having almost completely been lost, attempts to ascertain the function of the fable must remain idle. Possibly, Archilochus is deriding the aspirations of a member of the Parian aristocracy.[81]

4F3 Archil. fr. 237 West *ap.* Erot. σ 25 (p. 79 Nachmanson): Wolf and Dog ? (*Aes.* 346)

Although, in general, utmost prudence is called for when identifying short fragments with particular fables, even granted that Julian (4T20)[82] witnesses that fables frequently occur in Archilochus, the fragment under consideration—"how has he caused the scruff of his neck to waste away?"—, which has been preserved by Erotianus (4T2), seems to belong[83] to some version of a fable about a hungry

[77] Archibald 1902, p. LXXXIX: "quasi-epic"; Kirkwood 1974, 47; West 1974, 31; Lasserre 1984, 74; West (S.) lc: "comic". Pouilloux (J., "Archiloque et Thasos: histoire et poésie", in: Reverdin 1964, 12), however, thinks of an historical noble.

[78] Ar. Byz. fr. 367 Slater *ap.* Ath. 3.31, 85E: ἐν τῷ περὶ τῆς ἀχνυμένης σκυτάλης συγγράμματι; A.R. fr. 22 Michaelis *ap.* Ath. 10.74, 451D; Adrados 1955, 51-52; West (S.) 1988, 42. Cf. Demetr. *Eloc.* 5, Σ *in* Pi. *O.* 6.154a and c, Plu. *Mor.* 152E.

[79] Cf. Diogen. 3.25, Apostol. 4.68 (Arsen.3.68) ἐπὶ τῶν λυπρὰς ἀγγελίας ἀγγελλόντων; Erasm. *Adag.* 2.2.1 (p. 448C): *De re tristi seriaque dicebatur, aut de nuncio, qui dolorem adferret.*

[80] Silk lc, West (S.) lc; cf., in general, Phaedr. G14, Jul. G45, as well as the Synthesis above, n. 2. Adrados (1955, 52), however, interprets: "mensaje con visos de mucha importancia, pero en realidad insignificante". Slater (W.J., *Aristophanis Byzantii Fragmenta*, Berlin/New York: De Gruyter 1986, *ad* Ar. Byz. lc) suggests that Archilochus "took σκυτάλη to be a flute".

[81] Cf. Adrados 1979a, 34 (somewhat differently 1993, 3: "burla de los rivales del poeta"); Jedrkiewicz 1989, 315. Lasserre (1984, 76), however, believes that the ape stands for "un chef militaire".

[82] Von Blumenthal (1922, 51-52) may be right in nuancing differently: "Archilochus [wird] vorzüglich als Fabeldichter gehüldigt", comparing Theon 4T3 (G20c), Hermog. 4T15 (G41), and Philostr. 4T16 (G43). Wright (1913, II 79, n. 2), however, cautions that "Julian here [G50] ignores his own distinction" (like Wright himself (ibid.): "the beast-fable or parable"; cf. the Appendix below, n. 36).

[83] Thus Nøjgaard 1964, 450; Adrados 1979a, 527; Cascajero 1991, 22. One might object that Erotian witnesses that ancient opinions diverged on the exact meaning of σκύτα; cf. Nachmanson, E., *Erotianstudien*, Uppsala: Akademiska Bokhandeln; Leipzig: Harrassowitz 1917, 471; Bossi 1990, 240: "sarà...consigliabile rassegnarsi alle croci: così...Treu".

wolf who, when seeing a well-fed dog, at first admired him and wanted to adopt his domesticated way of life, but then wondered how the scruff of his neck had got that bare. When he learnt that the dog had to wear a collar, the wolf decidedly preferred his free yet poor existence to the dog's slavery in luxury.[84] The *fabula docet* is implicit[85] but clear: freedom is the *summum bonum*.

Since no other fragments can plausibly be attributed to this fable[86] and nothing is known of its context, it seems wise not to indulge in speculations about its function.[87]

5. *Semonides*

5F1 Semon. fr. 9 West *ap*. Ath. 7.54, 299C: Heron, Eel and Buzzard (*Aes.* 443)

The following two iambic trimeters[88] by Semonides[89], quoted by Athenaeus (5T2), probably constitute the *incipit*[90] of a fable:

"A heron[91] found a buzzard eating an eel from the Maeander River and took it away from him..."[92]

[84] Phaedr. 3.7; Babr. 100; Av. 37 (Lion instead of Wolf); Rom. 65 Thiele; *Tetr.* 1.3 (prosified in *fab. aes.* 294 Hausrath). Only in Phaedrus and Babrius the dog's neck shows the *marks* of a collar, in the other versions the dog is wearing a collar upon meeting the wolf (or lion). Adrados (1987a, 270) considers this fable to be "un derivado" from the fragment under consideration, but identifies it (ib. 108; 1979a, 413) with an earlier version of *Aes.* 92 (*fab. aes.* 94 Hausrath; cf. *Pa. Bodl.* 180 Chambry (*Aes.* 329)).

[85] The tetrastich and its Aesopic prosification add an absurd epimythium to the effect that "one should not eat gluttonously in unfortunate circumstances."

[86] Contra Lasserre-Bonnard 1958, 8-9, connecting fr. 49.7+73, 296 West, 22 Lasserre, 265 West, 25 Lasserre, 217, 65+67+216 West, largely followed by Nøjgaard 1964, 450.

[87] Like Jedrkiewicz (1989, 314, n. 34): "Archiloco avrebbe espresso il rifiuto di assoldarsi mercenario" (following Lasserre-Bonnard 1958, 9, but see Adrados 1990, I 102, n. 1).

[88] Nevertheless, Adrados (1979a, 495) numbers Semonides among the "autores secondarios de la lirica coral".

[89] Rutherford (1883, p. XXXII) and Nøjgaard (1964, 453) misleadingly retain the iotacized form "Simonides".

[90] It is less probable that they either summarize or allude to a fable, as Jedrkiewicz (1989, 326) suggests in the wake of Lasserre 1984, 64.

[91] Not a "sparviero", as Jedrkiewicz (1987, 60, n. 75) asserts.

[92] Translation by Perry 1965, 511.

The *couleur locale*[93] of the fable is noteworthy. Although nothing is known of the line of the story[94] nor of its context[95], one could, pointing to the typically fabulistic structure of the robber robbed[96], speculate that Semonides' fable perhaps illustrated the evanescence of property ("easy come, easy go", or: "crime does not pay").

5F2 Semon. fr. 13 West *ap.* Σ *in Il.* 18.407*b*, *Et. Gen.* *s.v.* ζῷον, *EM* *s.v.* ζωΐδιον, Ps.-Zonar. *Lex.* *s.v.* Ζῷον: Dung Beetle, Hare and Eagle ? (*Aes.* 3)

Another two iambic trimeters by Semonides[97]—"That insect flew past us which has the basest existence of all living creatures"[98], quoted by one grammarian (5T1), three lexicons (5T4-6), and one scholium which witnesses that Semonides is speaking "about the scarab" (5T3)—, perhaps[99] belong to the widespread fable about a dung beetle who repeatedly destroyed the eggs[100] of an eagle in revenge for the assassination of his refugee, a hare.[101] The above verses

[93] Nøjgaard 1964, 453; Pellizer-Tedeschi (1990, 177), however, adducing Clem. Al. *Paed.* 2.3.1, note that "le anguille del Meandro erano rinomate nell'antica gastronomia". Luzzatto (1988, 442, n. 66) states that "l'indicazione geografica...è un tratto arcaico".

[94] It is tempting to connect fr. 9 with fr. 8 West ὥσπερ ἔγχελυς κατὰ γλοιοῦ (*ap.* Ath. lc!) (thus Hausrath 1909, col. 1706; Nøjgaard 1964, 453; cf. Holzberg 1993, 14), which, however, is "doubtless from a sexual context" (West 1974, 179). On the other hand, it cannot perhaps be ruled out that in fr. 9 ἔγχελυν...τρίορχον...ἐσθίοντ' has a sexual connotation, too (cf. LSJ sv τριόρχης I-II; Ar. *Av.* 1206 with Coulon-Van Daele and Dunbar 1995 *ad loc.*; Henderson 1975 (19912), 21 (contra: Pellizer-Tedeschi 1990, 176); this is not to say that Denis (1883, 232) is right in connecting ἔγχελυν and τρίορχον, translating "une anguille lascive"). But fr. 8 makes perfect sense if it is simply interpreted as a comparison (cf. Dressel 1870, 21).

[95] Pellizer-Tedeschi (1990, 176) rightly oppose Welcker (F.G., "Simonidis Amorgini iambi qui supersunt", *RhM* 3, 1835, 424), who (unlike Perry 1965, 511) thought of the fable as "a sé stante".

[96] Jedrkiewicz (1989, 326) usefully compares *Aes.* 347 (Babr. 105; Adrados 1987a, 369).

[97] Simonides according to Adrados 1988a.

[98] Translation by Davies-Kathirithamby 1986, 3, n. 11; cf. *Anecd. Gr.*, II 371 Cramer.

[99] Contra: West 1984, 112, comparing Hippon. fr. 92.10 κάνθαρο[ι: "It is much more likely to be a detail from a scatological first-person narrative of a type characteristic of the iambos"; Von Möllendorff 1994, 144, n. 4; cf. Pellizer-Tedeschi 1990, 181.

[100] "Rolling the eagle's young out of its nest" (Bowie, A.M., *Aristophanes. Myth, Ritual and Comedy*, Cambridge: UP 1993 (repr. 1994), 135) would have been a Herculean task for a dung beetle!

[101] Ar. 17F5, 17A2, 17A5; *fab. aes.* 3 Hausrath; *Vit. Aesop.* 135-139GW (see Van Dijk 1995b, 146-147; 1996a, 530-541 *passim*); Luc. *Icar.* 10; Erasm. *Cop.* 2 (p. 254

could belong to the final episode[102], in which the beetle flew up to Zeus, in whose lap the eagle had laid his eggs, and dropped some manure, which made the god stand up to clean his clothes, thus breaking the eggs. The only way for Zeus, who put the beetle in the right when he had heard the full facts of the case, to prevent the eagle from extinction, was to separate the seasons of the two species. The fable thus has an aetiological function[103], and simultaneously shows that the small and weak can take revenge upon the big and powerful, and that violation of asylum cannot go with impunity.

Because it cannot be said how exactly[104], if at all, Semonides related this fable, and because its context has completely been lost, its function must remain unclear[105].

6. *Scolia*

6F1 *Scol.* 9, fr. 892 *PMG ap.* Ath. 15.50 (695A), Eust. *Od.* η 125: Crab and Snake (cf. *Aes.* 196)[106]

One of the Attic drinking songs quoted by Athenaeus (6T2) is a fable about a Crab and a Snake:

"The crab, seizing the snake in its claws, spoke thus: 'One's comrade should be straight and not think crooked thoughts.'"[107]

Knott). Adrados (1988b, 263; cf. 1993, 4-5) hypothesizes that Semon. 5F2 is a comic modification of Archil. 4F1a-h, incorporating the scarab's part in Egyptian mythology (which made Von Bissing (1949, 229) regard "Agypten als Geburtsland der Fabel").

[102] This is not to say that they "look[s] like an adaptation of a standard fable-closing formula" (Davies-Kathirithamby 1986, 3, n. 11).

[103] The original function of this fable according to Dahnhardt 1912, 276; Perry 1965, p. XXI; Blackham 1985, 186; cf. Eust. *Il.* Ω 292 τὸν ἐκ κανθάρων πόλεμον [*sc.* τὸν πρὸς τὸν αἰετόν].

[104] Crusius (1913, pp. XIVsq), Meuli (1954a, 738-739) and Karadagli (1981, 17-18) misleadingly insert Semon. fr. 13 West into a paraphrase or translation of *fab. aes.* 3 Hausrath.

[105] Hausrath (1918, 46, n. 3) asserts that "Semonides verwendet die Geschichte polemisch im Kampf der Stande" (likewise Crusius 1913, pp. XIVsq; Treu 1959, 235; Meuli 1954a, 739; Koep 1969, col. 141; Bauer 1973, 268; Karadagli 1981, 17-18); contra (rightly): Nøjgaard 1964, 451-452.

[106] Not "l'*Ecrevisse et sa fille* [*Aes.* 322]" (Denis 1883, 232); Adrados (1987a, 211-212) derives both *Aes.* 196 and *Aes.* 322 (Babr. 109, Aphth. 11, Av. 3, *Tetr.* 1.34) from the *scolion* under consideration.

[107] Translation by Campbell 1982-1993, V 285. Bowra (1961, 384) observes that "it is unique in its metrical form" (two telesillea plus two glyconics). Burger (1892)

This fable is not completely self-contained[108]: the words τὸν ἑταῖρον refer to some prologue in which a crab and a snake made friends (like Archilochus' fox and eagle), after which the latter, presumably for having proved to be untrustworthy, was killed by the former. Such a fable has in fact been preserved in the anonymous prose collections; this Aesopic version can usefully be compared but, of course, need not be identical with the quatrain under consideration.[109]

The context of the *scolion* is not literary but social[110]: it was performed at a symposium. The function of the fable within this context is to urge 'uprightness in friendship"[111]; thus Eustathius (6T3b). This is expressed in a *réplique finale*. By this device the direct speech works two ways: the crab thus addresses the snake but *at the same time* the guest his fellow symposiasts. This advice is accompanied by irony[112] because it puns on two meanings of εὐθύς and σκολιός[113]—cf. English "right" and "crooked"—: it is an empirical fact that a living serpent always snakes[114]; only a dead one is straight.[115] The effect of

---

transposes the two distichs in order to turn the quatrain into a Wellerism (see above, Quint. G18b).

[108] Cf. Nøjgaard 1964, 458: "fable abrégée"; Dalfen 1994/1995, 172-173; differently Führer 1967, 55: "in sich vollkommen[en]". Contra West (1984, 113). The *scolion* is not likely to be "an excerpt from a longer poem" (West lc) nor "der Schluss einer Tierfabel" (Reitzenstein 1893, 19). Megas (1960, 196-198) believes that the *scolion* (which he still (like Kleine 1828, 109; Du Méril 1854, 32; cf. Jacobs 1889, 28; Edmonds 1940, 658; contra: Dressel 1876, 21) attributes to Alcaeus) uses a "tale" similar to a popular version written down in 1914 in Megara and published in his *The Greek Tales*, 1956², 27-28.

[109] *Fab. aes.* 211 Hausrath (*Aes.* 196); cf. III ἑταιρείαν. Contra García Gual 1970, 425, n. 1.

[110] Less correctly: "una fábula sin primer término" (Adrados 1979a, 158); "le scolion a fait partie d'un contexte qui est perdu" Nøjgaard (1964, 458).

[111] Not "the Pot once called the Kettle black" (Edmonds 1940, 567, n. 2; likewise Adrados 1979a, 158 and 1987a, 211); Bowra (1961, 384-385) rightly remarks: "εὐθὺν ἔμμεν does not mean 'walk straight', nor is σκολιά the right word for the Crab's sideway progress." See Eustathius' paraphrase of the fable.

[112] This is not say that this "ne renferme pas de maxime générale, visant tout être humain" (Nøjgaard 1964, 498) or "deprive<s> it [the moral] of serious force. It is simply an amusing epigram" (West 1984, 114), nor that "there is no invective or personal tone at all" (Archibald 1912, 61).

[113] Cf. Archibald 1912, 60; Wüst 1921, 37; Nøjgaard 1964, 498; Pordomingo Pardo, F., "Poesía popular y ética en los skolia", in: *Actas del V Congreso Español...* 1978, 246.

[114] Danish snakes seem not to: "le serpent qui est tantôt tortu, tantôt droit" (Nøjgaard 1964, 498).

[115] Cf. Bowra 1961, 385; Campbell 1982-1993, V 285, n. 1.

this is that the gnomic utterance concerns the fellow guests of the speaker rather than the snake in the fable, for the latter can no longer hear the words of the crab. This effect is enhanced by the use of the word ἑταῖρον as accusative subject. It is perhaps not a coincidence that a very σκόλιον[116] puns on σκολιά. This additional *jeu de mots* contributes to the humorous way in which the advice, which in itself is serious, is put.

6A1 *Scol.* 6, fr. 889 *PMG ap.* Ath. 15.50 (694E), Eust. *Od.* η 125: Momus, Prometheus and Man (*Aes.* 100)

In addition to *Scol.* 6F1, Athenaeus (6T1) quotes also the following drinking song:

"If only it were possible to see what everyone is like by opening his breast and having looked at his mind to close it up again and regard the man as one's friend for his guileless heart."[117]

Eustathius (6T3a) adds: "This scolion comes from a Fable of Aesop,[118] in which Momus finds fault with Prometheus, because when he made man he did not add gates to the breast so that when they were opened we might see his heart, but allowed him to be a dissembler."[119]

The context of this *scolion* is the same as that of the one discussed above. Again, its theme is closely related to its social context, the symposium: it is about the difficulty of recognizing a true friend.

---

[116] LSJ sv: "prop. neut. of σκολιός (sc. μέλος), *song which went round crookedly at banquets*"; Plu. *Mor.* 615C, Dicaearch. Hist. (43) and Aristox. (*Fr. Hist.* 59) *ap.* Σ *in* Pl. *Grg.* 451e (p. 134 Greene).

[117] Translation by Campbell 1982-1993, V 283, pointing (ib. n. 1) to "a very funny parody" (1967, 450) in Ar. *Ec.* 938-941. For νοῦς and φρήν ("locations of a person's true nature and attitudes"), see Sullivan, S.D., "An Analysis of φρένες in the Greek Lyric Poets (excluding Pindar and Bacchylides)", *Glotta* 66, 1988, 32.

[118] Cf. Reitzenstein 1893, 19; Bowra 1961, 390; Campbell 1967, 126 and 1982-1993, V 283, n. 1. Adrados (1979a, 417), however, remarks that "es posible que la fábula derive precisamente del escolio".

[119] Translation by Edmonds 1940, 564-565, n. 1. Other versions: Plu. *Mor.* 645AB; Luc. *Herm.* 20 (Hephaestus), paraphrased by Erasmus (Pl. 49T13, Arist. 57T5); Babr. 59 (Zeus; the only version according to García Gual 1994, 608); *fab. aes.* 102 Hausrath (outside); *Pa. Bodl.* 125 Chambry (Zeus, outside); Niceph. Chrys. *Prog.* 3); cf. Arist. 57A2.

7. *Stesichorus*

7F1 Stesich. 103, fr. 280 *PMG ap.* Cratem Perg. *ap.* Ael. *NA* 17.37: Eagle, Serpent and Farmer (*Aes.* 395)

"Some men, sixteen in all, while reaping[120] under a blazing sun were distressed by thirst and sent one of their number to fetch water from a nearby spring: and the man who went had his reaper's sickle in his hand and carried the pitcher on his shoulder. When he got there, he found an eagle held firmly and carefully in the coils of a snake: it had swooped down on the snake but failed to carry out its intention and carried no banquet to its young—the expression is Homer's[121]; instead, it was caught in the snake's coils and far from killing looked like being killed. Now the countryman knew that the eagle was the messenger and servant of Zeus and the snake an evil creature, so he cut the snake in two with his sickle and freed the eagle from the prison from which there had been no escape. So the man performed this extra task on his errand, then drew the water, went back, mixed it with the wine and handed it to all his companions, who drank many cups in great gulps over their lunch. He intended to drink after them—he happened on that occasion to be the serving-man, not their fellow-drinker. But when he put the cup to his lips, the eagle he had saved—luckily for him it was still around—repaid him for its life by swooping on the cup, knocking it from his hand and spilling the drink. He was furious, for he was a thirsty man, and said, 'So it is you again'—he had recognised it—'and this is how you repay the one who saved you? How can such good deeds seem attractive after this? How will anyone else be ready to exert himself on another's behalf, out of respect for Zeus, the overseer and superintendent of gratitude?' Those were his words, and he was becoming parched; but he turned round and saw the men who had drunk gasping and at death's door. The snake, it would seem, had vomited into the spring and polluted it with its venom. And so the eagle repaid the man who had saved its life by saving his life in turn."[122]

After having related this lengthy fable, which contains some typi-

---

[120] Not "que se disponían a celebrar un banquete" (Adrados 1978c, 293).

[121] Il. 12.219-222; see above, 1. Hom., n. 9; Crates Perg. 60F/A1; Kindstrand, J.F., "Homer in den Tiergeschichten des Ailianos", *Hermes* 104, 1976, 39, 42. Cf. also Archil. 4F1a-h (and the Etana myth).

[122] Translation by Campbell 1982-1993, II, 197-199.

cally fabulistic elements[123], Aelian[124] (7T4) adds that "Crates of Pergamon [7T2 = 60T1] says that Stesichorus sings of this in one of his poems which is not widely known, and Stesichorus in my view is an impressive and ancient authority for him to cite."[125] It is uncertain whether Aelian's and Crates' testimonies are reliable[126]; even if they are, the function of this fable must remain unknown since nothing is known about its quondam context.[127] The other extant versions of this fable, by Aphthonius and by Tzetzes[128], do not connect the fable with Stesichorus, but this need not be conclusive. Especially when compared to Aphthonius' and Tzetzes' versions, the version under consideration is characterized by a complex structure[129] and a religious dimension, which is apparent from a threefold mention of Zeus[130], but it cannot be said whether these features are due to Aelian, Crates, or Stesichorus.

---

[123] ὑπό τινος ὄφεως (cf. πῶς); ἐπιστραφεὶς (preparing the *dénouement*; cf. e.g. *fab. aes.* 84.8, 99.6 (cf. 2), 115.5 Hausrath; Aphth. 32.4; Synt. 33.2; *Tetr.* 1.46.4 στραφείς, 2.10.2 στραφέντες). For the theme of the grateful eagle, cf. *Pa.Bodl.* 79 Chambry (according to Adrados (1987a, 311) "un derivado").

[124] Apostol. (1.78) and Arsen. (2.36) copy Aelian's fable but omit his mention of Crates and Stesichorus.

[125] Translation by Campbell 1982-1993, III 199.

[126] This is contested by Neubner 1889, 16; Vürtheim 1919, 79. Lasserre (1984, 66-67) believes that the fable occurred in a prose biography, which is at least in contradiction with Crates' testimony (ᾄδειν ἔν τινι ποιήματι). Adrados (1982c, 173; 1990, II 318) detects Stesichorean iambs in Aelian's paraphrase (contra: Slings 1983a, 395; see below, n. 158). West (discussion after Lasserre 1984, 99) understands Stesichorus "(despite his name)" "as a solo singer". Kraus (W., "Stesichoros" (1-2), *DKP* 5, col. 367-368) cautiously (if not unambiguously) attributes the fable to a homonymous townsman (but not a contemporary) of the lyrical poet.

[127] Adrados (1978c, 294-295) is overconfident: "sin duda se cantaba en un banquete y aconsejaba a los asistentes distinguir entre el verdadero enemigo y el enemigo sólo aparente...que en realidad es un amigo." But see 1990, II 318, n. 2: "ilustraba una situación particular, sin duda política."

[128] Aphth. 28; Tz. *H.* 4.305-315 (134; not mentioned by Adrados 1987a, 320-321). Tzetzes closely adheres to the version preserved by Aelian, witness 306 ἐξέσωσεν; 307 τῷ δρεπάνῳ, τοῦ θηρίου; 308 ἑκκαίδεκα; 309 σταλεὶς, ὕδωρ; 310 πᾶσι, τὸν οἶνον; 311 κεράσας, καὶ αὐτὸς ἔμελλε πίνειν; 313 ἐμέσαντα, 314 στραφεὶς; 315 θνήσκοντας (not counting 305 ἀετός and 313 ὄφις).

[129] Denis (1883, 284) holds that "elle est beaucoup trop compliquée pour être une véritable fable, à la façon d'Ésope" and prefers to consider it as "un ancien conte mythologique". First, this smacks of the old prejudice (see Knauth contra Lindner (above, Chapter I.I, 2.13, with n. 184 for some counterexamples)), that fables are always short. Furthermore, Aphthonius' version shows that the fable can easily be abridged.

[130] οὐ μὰ Δί', Διὸς ἄγγελον καὶ ὑπηρέτην, αἰδοῖ Διὸς χαρίτων ἐφόρου τε καὶ ἐπόπτου.

7F2 Stesich. 104(a), fr. 281(a)[131] *PMG ap.* Arist. *Rh.* 2.20 (1393b8-22), Conon. *FGrHist*26F1(*Narr.*).42: Horse, Stag and Man (*Aes.* 269a)

Both Aristotle (7T1 (T16 Campbell); G5; Latin versions: 7T7-9) and Conon (7T3; *ap.* Phot. (7T6))[132] put a fable (termed λόγος by Aristotle, μῦθος by anon. *in Rh.* (7T5a), and αἶνος by Conon) into Stesichorus' mouth about a horse who was bent on revenge on a stag[133] for destroying[134] his meadow and therefore called in a man[135], who promised to help him if only the horse took a bit in his mouth and allowed him to mount him armed with javelins. The vindictive horse[136] complied with his requests and thus got his revenge at a high price: his freedom.

The two versions differ slightly in that the latter is more explicit than the former in four respects: (1) Conon depicts the stag more as a vandal by having him not only destroy the grazing land of the horse but in addition muddy the well from which the horse wants to drink; (2) Conon (unlike Aristotle) reports the reason why the horse enlisted human aid: he dropped back behind the stag; (3) in Aristotle the tritagonist is just "a man", in Conon more precisely "a hunter"; (4) Conon explicitly reports that the stag was killed, which is only implicit in Aristotle's version[137]. One further matter of detail may be noted: in Aristotle the stag is male (hart), in Conon female (hind).

Both Aristotle and Conon have Stesichorus tell this fable to the

---

[131] Contra: Rizzo 1895, 37: "non è da ripportare tra' frammenti di Stesicoro".

[132] Unlike Plutarch (contra Rutherford 1883, pp. XXXIIsq, n. 2, probably referring to *Arat.* 38.9), Hor. *Ep.* 1.10.34-41 (see Della Corte 1986, 91-93; Warmuth 1992, 149-152), Rom. 79 Thiele, and Niceph. Basil. *Prog.* 1.2 (*addendum* to Adrados 1987a, 229), but possibly like Philist. 33F1. Perry (1959, 27; 1965, p. XXXIII) points to a parallel from the *Achiqar Romance.* Kassel (1971, 138) suggests that Aristotle quotes from some unknown source.

[133] Not "il cinghiale" (Jedrkiewicz 1989, 327), figuring in other versions (*PRyl.* 493.19-34; Phaedr. 4.4, *fab. aes.* 238 Hausrath, *Pa.Bodl.* 144 Chambry, *Tetr.* 1.53 (*Aes.* 269); see Nøjgaard 1963).

[134] Not for stealing it (contra Lasserre 1984, 85).

[135] Not *vice versa* (contra Adrados 1985, 97). Aristotle's (and one Latin (7T7)) version has the typically indefinite pronoun: τινά (*quendam*). Both Latin versions (7T7-8) equip the man with one single spear.

[136] Not the stag (thus anon. *in Rh.* (7T5b))!

[137] 1393b17-18 ἀντὶ τοῦ τιμωρήσασθαι; cf. the Latin versions: *causa tormentandi* (7T7), *pro eo ut puniret* (7T8), *victor* (Abst. (7T9)). Differently Hinman 1935, 73; Nøjgaard 1963, 5; Karadagli 1981, 15; Kennedy 1991, 180: "instead of getting vengeance"; cf. Roberts 1946.

inhabitants of Himera[138], who are about to give their army commander a bodyguard in fighting the enemy (cf. anon. *in Rh.* (7T5a)). Again, some differences can be observed between Aristotle's and Conon's description of the context, both politically and rhetorically. To begin with the latter, Aristotle (in accordance with his general advice (G5)) has Stesichorus *end* his speech with the fable[139], whereas Conon suggests that Stesichorus *began* by telling the fable (which according to Aristotle is far less effective) upon taking the floor.[140] As regards their accounts of the *political* context of Stesichorus' fable, in Aristotle's version the Himeraeans are commanded by Phalaris, tyrant of Acragas (570-554 BC), in Conon's version by Gelo[141], tyrant of Gela (491-478 BC), the mother-state of Acragas[142]. Whereas Phalaris is a contemporary of Stesichorus[143], Gelo is not[144]; the latter may have been associated with Himera because of his naval victory on the Carthaginians off Himera in 480 BC.[145] Not only the commanders but also the enemies are different. Aristotle confronts the Himeraeans with πολέμιοι (public enemies), Conon with ἐχθροί (private enemies). In Aristotle, Phalaris[146] has already been elected their absolute commander-in-chief. In Conon, Gelo pretends to oppose the aristocracy (κατὰ τῶν δυνατῶν) on behalf of the people but secretly aspires tyranny.

In spite of the differences between the two versions and their respective contexts, the function of the fable within its (political) context remains the same. Stesichorus tells the fable, in itself an aetiology of

---

[138] Not "die Athener" (Josifović 1974, col. 36), although Adrados (1987a, 229) thinks that Sol. frr. 8-10 (9, 12, 10 West; *ap.* D.S. 9.20, Plu. *Sol.* 3.6, D.L. 1.49) are influenced by Stesichorus.

[139] Cf. the translations by Roberts 1946 and Campbell 1982-1993, III 39.

[140] Compare Arist. τἆλλα διαλεχθεὶς [for which *cum alia dissenuisset* (*Guil.*) is a better Latin translation than *alia disputans* (*anon.*)] εἶπεν αὐτοῖς λόγον and Conon στὰς αἶνον ἔλεξεν.

[141] This variation does not legitimate Vurtheim's deduction (1919, 77): "Folglich war der Name irrelevant und wurde der αἶνος mit jedem beliebigen Tyrann verbunden."

[142] Th. 6.4; Boardman 1973, 183-184.

[143] Tz. *Vit. Hes.* 18 (p. 38 Colonna) = Stesich. T5 Campbell); cf. Tz. *H.* 1.674sqq (25), 5.927sqq (31).

[144] Kleine (1828, 19-20) and Cope-Sandys (1877, 199-200) contra Bentley; Rizzo (1895, 39, n. 1) contra Nageotte and Bernage; Cascajero 1991, 24, n. 30.

[145] Cf. Woodhead, A.G., *The Greeks in the West*, London: Thames and Hudson 1962, 55; Adrados 1982c, 162.

[146] Who actually assisted the Himeraeans against the Carthaginians according to Volkmann, H., "Phalaris", *DKP* 4, col. 698.

the domestication of the horse[147], to dissuade the Himeraeans from giving Phalaris (Gelo) a bodyguard. The Himeraeans, their enemies, and their army commander correspond to the horse[148], the stag, and the man (hunter), respectively. Both versions subtly represent the enemies as the aggressor: the stag intrudes the meadow of the horse. Conon's version is even more biased, for it contains a clue for its moral evaluation: the stag (and, thereby, the enemy) is described as "the wronger" (τὴν ἀδικοῦσαν); the fable thus subtly legitimates the horse's (and, thereby, the Himeraeans') vindictiveness. In Aristotle's version fable and context fit closely: a stag intruding the private meadow of a horse is a fortunate image for an enemy invading the territory of a city state. The fable seems to be less apt as an image of a *civil* war. On the other hand, one of Conon's additions seems to adapt the fable to this new context: when relating that the stag "muddied" (ἐτάραττε) the well of the horse, Conon selects a verb that is frequently used "of political agitation"[149]; to muddy water is a traditional image of fermenting political trouble[150].

The fable is explained in an epimythium. Aristotle's epimythium is introduced by a typical formula[151] and clarifies the analogy between the fable and its context by four different devices: (1) explicit comparison of the Himeraeans to the horse[152]; (2) juxtaposition of two elements of the fable and its context[153], which show that the danger is really imminent: "you (says Stesichorus addressing the Himeraeans) already have the bit in the mouth, having elected a general with full authority[154], but if you give him a bodyguard and (καὶ *explicativum*)

[147] Thiele 1908, 380 (contra: Karadagli 1981, 16, n. 1, overlooking that an aetiological fable can have a hortatory function (another example is Ar. 17F6)); Adrados (1982c, 265; 1987a, 229).

[148] Contra: Fischer 1891, 12: "Was hat Phalaris so Humanes, dass er als Mensch 'allegorisiert' wird?"

[149] LSJ sv ταράσσω.

[150] Cf. Ar. *Eq.* 864-867, for which see the Appendix below.

[151] οὕτω δὲ καὶ ὑμεῖς [Arist. Lat. *Sic autem et nos* [sic] (*anon.*); *Ita autem et vos* (*Guil.*)]; Fraenkel 1920, 367; Perry 1940, 396; Nøjgaard 1964, 503; Karadagli 1981, 113; Lasserre (discussion after Adrados 1984), 190; Holzberg 1993, 23 (above, Chapter I.I, 1.9).

[152] 19-20 ὁρᾶτε μὴ...τὸ αὐτὸ πάθητε τῷ ἵππῳ.

[153] 20-21 τὸν μὲν χαλινὸν ἔχετε ἤδη, ἑλόμενοι στρατηγὸν αὐτοκράτορα; 21-22 ἐὰν δὲ φυλακὴν δῶτε καὶ ἀναβῆναι ἐάσητε.

[154] Bowra's (1961, 119: "Aristotle says that Stesichorus opposed the election of Phalaris as general") and Lasserre's (1984, 85: "A la garde armée que réclame Phalaris correspondent le mors et les armes qu'exige le cavalier") paraphrases are inaccurate.

allow him to mount you...", in other words, the Himeraeans are already halfway through losing their freedom; (3) two verbal parallels[155], which solve all three unknowns in the equation: a horse, "bent on revenge on a stag", "became the slave of a man" ~ you (the Himeraeans), "bent on revenge on your enemies", "will become Phalaris' slaves"—ergo: horse ~ Himeraeans, stag ~ enemies, man ~ Phalaris; (4) "continuation of the metaphor": the Himeraeans are described in terms of the horse: Stesichorus warns them that they already have taken the bit in their mouths but must not accept Phalaris as their horseman.[156] Of these four devices Conon's epimythium retains only the third, although he has only one verbal parallel (δουλεύσετε ~ δεδουλωμένος), and transfers the first: Stesichorus' fable is announced as a metaphorical picture of the Himeraeans' fate[157].

It is far from certain, to say the least, that Stesichorus, himself a choral lyric, actually used—either orally or in writing—this fable in this particular ((pseudo-)historical) context.[158] The fable—and its context (the anecdote)—may simply have been connected with Stesichorus because the poet was a citizen of Himera and seems to have advocated a moderate line in politics.[159]

Most testimonies do not report the reaction of the audience, but Abstemius (7T9) reports that Stesichorus' fable frightened the Himeraeans and made them give up their plan.[160]

---

[155] 19-20 βουλόμενοι...τιμωρήσασθαι ~ 14 βουλόμενος τιμωρήσασθαι, 15, 18 τιμωρήσασθαι; 22 δουλεύσετε ~ 18 ἐδούλευσε; cf. 16, 20 χαλινόν, 22 ἀναβῆναι ~ 16 ἀναβῇ, 17 ἀναβάντος.

[156] Cf. Arist. Lat. *frenum, ascendere* (*anon.*)/*supergredi* (*Guil.*); Fischer 1891, 12.

[157] αἶνον...εἰκόνα τοῦ μέλλοντος πάθους.

[158] Contra Hinman (1935, 72), listing the fable as "quotation", Janssens (1955, 17), and Adrados 1978c, 293-296; 1982c, 159-173; 1985, 96-97: "En ambas prosificaciones hay restos de verso yámbico..., con ayuda de los cuales es factible lograr una reconstrucción parcial del poema de Estesícoro"; cf. 1990, II 317-318 (contra (rightly): Slings 1983a, 395, Lasserre (1984, 66, n. 5; review of Adrados 1985-1987a, *MH* 45, 1988, 261). Kleine (1828, 109 contra *Sudam*, τ 943 Adler; cf. Zen. I 23 Miller; D'Alfonso, F., *Stesicoro e la performance. Studio sulle modalità esecutive dei carmi stesicorei*, Roma: GEI 1994, 34-35 (in general)) thought that the poet used "lyricis numeris", but not "stropharum epodicarum forma[m]". Nestle (1942, 73) believes that the fable occurred in Stesichorean prose, Lasserre (lc) in a prose biography (contra (rightly): Adrados in the subsequent discussion, 97). For West's stand, see above, n. 126.

[159] Arist. *Rh.* 2.21, 1395a1-2 (see also the Appendix below); Diog. Bab. *ap.* Phld. *Mus.* p. 18 Kemke (*SVF* 3 232); West 1971, 303. Bowra (1961, 119) assumes that the fable "is no more than a local tale"; cf. Ziegler, K., "Himera", *DKP* 2, col. 1148: "Der Bericht...ist legendarisch".

[160] *Quibus verbis territi Himerenses, huiusmodi ducis eligendi consilium deposuere.* Likewise Gellert 1744, 18: *optimo euentu*; Demandt 1991, 407.

8. *Ibycus*

8F1 Ibyc. 61, fr. 342 *PMG ap.* Ael. *NA* 6.51; 32, fr. 313 *PMG ap.* Chrysipp. Stoic. fr. 180.14 *SVF* (?): Ass and Snake (*Aes.* 458)

Aelian (8T2) relates a fable[161] (μῦθος), which—like the fable which he reports from Stesichorus (7F1)—is about thirst, a (typically unspecified: τινα) well, and a serpent[162]: the triple aetiology of the *dipsas*' thirst-causing bite as well as of man's loss, and the serpents' gain, of immortality.[163] Aelian's version, like Nicander's (3F1), connects the fable with man's report of Prometheus' theft of fire from Zeus. The last aetiology is (as in Nicander) based upon the ambiguity of γῆρας. Again, the first aetiology is the main, if not the sole, reason that the fable is inserted here: the story is preceded by, and linked (also by verbal parallels[164]) with, a description of the διψάς and the unquenchable thirst which its bite provokes. Aelian's version does not retain Nicander's *kenningar* nor the wordplay with γέρας and γῆρας. Instead, Aelian gives other telling names of the serpent (besides διψάς): πρηστήρ ("burner"), καύσων (id.), κεντρίς ("pricker"), μελάνουρος ("black-tail"), ἀμμοβάτης ("sand-burrower"[165]). The first three of these names refer to the effect of its bite, the other two to its outward appearance and habitat, respectively.

As in his report of the fable ascribed to Stesichorus (7F1), Aelian adds his sources, in this case five Archaic and Classical poets, among whom (besides Aristias (11F1), Sophocles (14F1), Dinolochus (16F1), and Apollophanes (18F1)) Ibycus of Rhegium. A dactylic fragment of his, preserved by Chrysippus (8T1 = 56A1), can be assumed to belong to this fable:

"the dead cannot now find a remedy to restore life"[166].

This assumption is supported by the occurrence of φάρμακον in

---

[161] Contra: Neubner 1889, 19. Mosino, F., *Ibico*, Reggio Calabria 1966, 79: "leggenda".

[162] Adrados (1987c, 8) thinks that Ibycus borrowed this (quite common) motif from Stesichorus. With ἐπί τινα κρήνην compare Stesich. 7T4 (Ael.) ὑπό τινος ὄφεως (n. 123 above).

[163] Burkert (1984, 113) compares an episode from the Akkadian *Epic of Gilgamesh* XI (translated by Dalley 1991, 118-119; cf. ib. 134, n. 144; Bates 1934, 168; Adrados 1987c and 1993, 5).

[164] c.: πιεῖν ~ f. πίνει; c. διψάδος/διψάδα, c.f. δίψος, f. διψῶντα.

[165] LSJ sv.

[166] Davies 1987, 72-73; translation by Campbell 1982-1993, III 273.

both Aelian's and Chrysippus' testimonies, as well as by the use of ἔτι[167] ("(no) longer"). Granted that the fragment preserved by the latter is really to be combined with the testimony of the former, two variations between Ibycus' version and Aelian's paraphrase may be observed. First, Ibycus seems to have told, or alluded to, the fable because of the second aetiology (man's loss of immortality), Aelian because of the first (the name διψάς) and the third (the serpents' discarding old age). Secondly, Ibycus describes the φάρμακον positively: "to restore life" (ζωᾶς), Aelian negatively: "warding off old age" (γήρως ἀμυντήριον).[168] Furthermore, the fragment seems to justify the deduction that Ibycus already connected the aetiology with some story according to which the drug was granted to mankind as a recompense (possibly for their report of Prometheus' theft of fire from Zeus).

9. *Simonides*[169]

9F1 Simon. 9, fr. 514 *PMG ap.* Ath. 7.107, 318F; cf. Ps.-Diogenian. *Praef.* (p. 179 L-S), *Cod. Paris. suppl. gr.* 676 (p. 79 Cohn): Fisherman and Octopus (*Aes.* 425)

Pseudo-Diogenianus (9T1; G28) exemplifies the Carian fable[170] (αἶνος) by relating how in the winter a Carian fisherman[171] saw an octopus and said: "If I strip[172] and dive in after him, I'll freeze, but if I don't catch this octopus, I'll bring my children to starvation[173]."

---

[167] "story-telling" according to Davies 1987, 73, adducing fr. 13, 294 *PMG ap.* Σ *in* Pi. *N.* 10.12a.

[168] Likewise Nic. 3T1b (Σ) τοῦ γήρως τὸ φάρμακον. Davies (1987, 73, n. 43), however, holds that "the distinction...is unlikely to be at all significant."

[169] Besides, Simonides is the protagonist in two Phaedrian fables: 4.23 (*Aes.* 519), which, however, according to Christ (1941, 67, n. 1), "nicht zu Simonides gehört"; 4.26 (*Aes.* 522; cf. Molyneux, J.H., "Simonides and the Dioscuri", *Phoenix* 25, 1971, 197-205 (contra: Slater, W.J., "Simonides' House", *Phoenix* 26, 1972, 233, n. 4)).

[170] Contra: Neubner 1889, 19. Cf. Macar. 5.9.

[171] Τοῦτον [*sc.* Κᾶρα ἄνδρα]...ἁλιέα τυγχάνοντα, erroneously divided by Adrados (1979a, 161) into two characters: "fábula del pescador, el propio cario y el pulpo". The Carian *is* the fisherman.

[172] ἀποδύς, one of "zwei nicht gerade unentbehrliche Wörter" (*quod non*) which Adrados (1982c, 175; cf. 1990, II 311-312) proposes to delete in order to reconstruct Semonidean choliambs (see below, n. 178).

[173] τῷ λιμῷ τὰ παιδί' ἀπολῶ; incorrectly paraphrased by both Adrados (1982c, 174: "werde er Hungers sterben") and Jedrkiewicz 1989, 330: "muore di fame con tutta la sua famiglia". English translation quoted from Daly 1961a, 232 (= Perry 1965, 504).

This brief[174] fable is even cut in half in a Parisian Codex[175] (9T3): "A fisherman saw an octopus in the winter and said: "If I don't dive, I'll be hungry." This version omits[176] the first possibility of the fisherman's dilemma. Besides, the expected result of his inactivity is less grave.[177] A iambic fragment of Simonides[178], preserved by Athenaeus[179] (9T2), may[180] belong to this fable:

"looking for an octopus[181]".

Pseudo-Diogenianus also gives an indication of the quondam context of this Carian fable (λόγος) by adding that "Simonides refers to it in his victory ode for Orillas."[182] Besides, the Parisian Codex reports that "Simonides mentions this when singing the praises of a charioteer who had been victorious at Pallene and had won as his prize a cloak which he used to keep off the cold; for (the games) were held at Pallene in winter."[183] If Pseudo-Diogenianus and the Codex both refer to the same *epinikion*, which is probable, it can be concluded that Simonides used[184] the Carian fable in his epinician for Orillas, who won a mantle when his horses or mules[185] were victori-

---

[174] It exemplifies Adrados' "fábula de situación" (1979a, 169; 1982c, 174), for which see above, Chapter I.I, 1.6.

[175] Zenobius? (see Cohn, L., "Zu den Paroemiographen. Mitteilungen aus Handschriften", *Breslauer Philologische Abhandlungen* II.2, 1887 (repr. in: *CPG Suppl.*, Hildesheim: Olms 1961, 79); Buhler 1987, 156).

[176] Nevertheless, Jedrkiewicz translates (1989, 330, n. 85): "o mi tuffo ed ho freddo; o non mi tuffo e soffro la fame."

[177] Jedrkiewicz lc.

[178] Semonides according to Adrados (1982c, 173-176), who argues that (chol)iambs (preserved by Athenaeus and reconstructed by Adrados from the two prose paraphrases of the fable) are out of place in an *epinikion* (contra (rightly): Lasserre 1984, 98; Jedrkiewicz 1989, 330, n. 84).

[179] A few lines before quoting Simonides, Athenaeus quotes Archestratos who witnesses that Carian octopuses are excellent; Thompson 1947, 208.

[180] Komornicka, A.M., *Simonides z Keos. Poeta i medrzec*, Wroclaw... 1986, 89-90 (I am indebted to Dr. Annegret Plontke-Luning for kindly helping me decipher the Polish at the Fondation Hardt). Adrados' combination (1990, II 311) of the testimonia into one "fr. *35" seems overconfident.

[181] πώλυπον, the Dorian equivalent, says Athenaeus, of Attic πούλυπουν, which Adrados (1982c, 174), ascribing it to Semonides of Amorgos, not Simonides of Ceos (see above, n. 172) doubts. Thompson 1947, 204: "The alternative declension, πώλυπος -ου, and the quantity of Lat. *polypus*, suggest that πολύπους -οδος is influenced by *Volksetymologie*, and that the real word is non-Hellenic."

[182] Translation by Daly lc.

[183] Translation by Campbell 1982-1993, III 383.

[184] Not necessarily "mit humorvollem Unterton", as Adrados states (1982c, 175), considering "satirische Züge" (ib. 176) unfitting in an *epinikion* by Simonides (cf. above, n. 172).

[185] Cf. Page *ad* Simon. lc: (ΤΕΘΡΙΠΠΟΙΣ Η ΑΠΗΝΗΙ).

ous in Pellene. It is known from Pindar and Strabo that in Pellene, at the games in honour of Apollo Theoxenios, woollen mantles were indeed set as prizes.[186]

The analogy between the fable and the situation in which it was allegedly told—the literary context (the *epinikion* in which the fable was inserted) has not survived—is somewhat problematic. Obviously, the fisherman stands for Orillas, and the octopus for the woollen mantle. Furthermore, the fable and its context share the theme of frosty cold. But: Orillas was victorious, the fisherman in a quandary. We may, however, follow the former's rather than the latter's example by looking for a way out of the present dilemma: both the Carian and Orillas have been in a similar situation, if only in that they both had to undress to reach their goal while they (could have) feared that they would thus succumb to the cold.[187]

10. *Timocreon*

10F1 Timocr. 4, fr. 730 *PMG ap.* Ps.-Diogenian. *Praef.* (p. 180 L-S), anon. *Περὶ αἴνου* (p. 154.13-25 Bartoletti): Cypriots and Pigeons (not in *Aes.*)

Shortly after the Carian fable discussed above (Simon. 9F1; cf. Timocr. 10F2), Pseudo-Diogenianus (10T3; G28 also exemplifies the Cyprian[188] fable[189], this time by a prose paraphrase of a fable from Timocreon:

"When Adonis had been honoured in Cyprus by Aphrodite after his death, the Cyprians threw live doves on his body; these flew away and escaped, but later they unexpectedly fell on another pyre and perished."[190]

The paroemiographer has this fable be preceded by a promythium, according to which Timocreon uses this fable "to show

[186] Pi. *O.* 9.97-98; id. *N.* 10.44; Σ *ad loc.*; Str. 8.7.5; Meyer, E., "Pellene", *RE* 19.1, Stuttgart 1937, col. 365-366. Paus. 7.27.4, however, mentions ἀργύριον as prize.

[187] Differently Jedrkiewicz 1989, 330: "forse operava *a contrario*".

[188] In view of the contact between Cyprus and Rhodes (cf. Boardman 1973, 70-71), one should not wonder that Timocreon, who was a native from Ialysos, told a Cyprian fable.

[189] Hausrath (1909, col. 1722): "Mythe".

[190] Translations in this subsection are by Campbell 1982-1993, IV 89-93.

that wrong-doers[191] eventually meet their deserts." Pseudo-Diogenianus thus attributes a general application with a moral function to Timocreon's Cyprian fable.

However, its application is likely to have been rather specific, its function satirical. For an anonymous treatise *Περὶ αἴνου* (10T4; G39), which has been preserved on a lacunal papyrus, shows that Timocreon probably used this fable to mock Themistocles. Like Pseudo-Diogenianus, the anonym exemplifies the Cyprian fable by a sample from Timocreon. In the papryus (suppleted by Bartoletti) the fable proper has not been preserved, but striking parallels between the two treatises, both in wording[192] and in content[193], make it plausible that the anonym's exemplification was the same as Pseudo-Diogenianus'. The anonym summarizes the context of the fable as follows: "Timocreon uses it in a song against Themistocles after his banishment from Greece, to express his delight in the man's exile." He then quotes Timocreon, instead of giving a mere paraphrase. The only words which are legible on the papyrus probably stem from Timocreon's introduction of the fable: "(I shall tell) you a story [λό[γ]ον 'fable']...(these things?) to you...(of) the three talents...guest-friend..." These last words—"three talents", "guest-friend"—also occur in one of the three bitter poems by Timocreon against Themistocles quoted in Plutarch's *Life of Themistocles*[194]. This fragment criticizes "Themistocles...who was bribed with mischievous silver and would not take Timocreon home to his native Ialysus, although he was his guest-friend[195]. Instead he accepted three talents of silver..." Further on, Plutarch reports that "it is said that Timocreon was exiled on a

[191] Hausrath (lc) objects that "das ἄδικα πράσσοντες der vorausgeschickten Moral doch nur ungenugend illustriert wird." But, first, the pigeons can be said to do wrong, in that they fly away whereas they were destined to be a burnt offering to Adonis; secondly, the words are to the point if Themistocles is Timocreon's addressee (see below).

[192] Ps.-Diogenian.: ὁ δὲ Κύπριος προσηγόρευται διὰ τὸ παρὰ Κυπρίοις λέγεσθαι ὡς ἐπιχώριος. κέχρηται δὲ καὶ τούτῳ Τιμοκρέων... Anon. *Περὶ αἴνου:* ὁ δὲ Κύπρι[ο]ς λεγό[μενος] | αἶνος ὄνομα τοιο[ῦτον] | ἤνεγκεν...[...διὰ τὸ] παρὰ Κυπρίοις ἐπ[ιχώρι-] | [ο]ς λέγεσθαι. κέχρη[ταὶ δὲ τού-] | [τῳ] Τιμοκρέων...

[193] Both exemplify the Sybaritic fable by Ar. 17F3.

[194] Plu. *Them.* 21 (Timocr. 727, fr. 1 *PMG*): 5 Τιμοκρέοντα ξεῖνον ἔοντα; 8 τρί' ἀργυρίου τάλαντ'. Cf. λέγει δ' οὕτως. Cf. Frost, F.J., *Plutarch's Themistocles. A Historical Commentary*, Princeton, NJ: Princeton UP 1980, 3-4, 182-183.

[195] ξεῖνον. Robertson (1980, 67) prefers to interpret this word as "'a stranger abroad'", although Plutarch gives it "its special meaning 'guest-friend' [Plu. *Them.* 21.1: ξένον ὄντα καὶ φίλον]".

charge of Medism, Themistocles joining in the vote against him"[196]. Hence the poet's sarcastic joy when Themistocles himself was ostracized on the same charge[197] (ca. 472 BC). It is known from Thucydides[198] that Themistocles fled via the Peloponnesus to Persia, to Xerxes' (or Artaxerxes') court.

If Pseudo-Diogenianus' and the anonym's testimonies may be combined[199], it is clear that Timocreon compared the banished Themistocles' flight from his fellow-citizens to Persia to the Cypriots' pigeons' flight from one to another pyre. The two testimonies provide two verbal parallels, which connect the fable (as preserved in Pseudo-Diogenianus' paraphrase) with its context (as summarized in the lacunal papyrus suppleted by Bartoletti).[200] Although prudence is of course called for, these parallels stress the similarity between Themistocles and the sacrificial doves. These parallels also seem to pun on φεύγω and ἐκπίπτω, literally "to flee" and "to fall out", but both meaning more specifically "to be exiled". The pigeons literally "flee away" (διαφυγοῦσαι), only to "fall into" (ἐμπεσοῦσαι) another fire, whereas Themistocles is exiled (φυγῇ, ἐκπεσόντος). These *jeux de mots* contribute to the sarcasm of the fable. If Timocreon really used this fable against Themistocles, he not only ridicules but also threatens him that by running away he will only jump out of the frying pan into the fire—the pigeons are burnt alive![201]

---

[196] Plu. *Them.* 21.7. Maas, P., "Timokreon", *RE* 6.1 (zweite Reihe), Stuttgart: Metzler 1936, col. 1272 considers this to be a "Nachtrag von fremder Hand". Wolski, J., "Μηδισμός et son importance en Grèce à l'époque des guerres médiques", *Historia* 22, 1973, 11, deems the punishment mild.

[197] Cf. Kahrstedt, U., "Themistokles (1)", *RE* 5.2 (zweite Reihe), Stuttgart: Metzler 1934, col. 1693 (*pro* "Simonides" *leg.* "Timokreon").

[198] Th. 1.135-138 with Gomme, A.W., *A Historical Commentary on Thucydides*, I, Oxford: Clarendon P 1950 (corr. 1945) and Hornblower, S., *A Commentary on Thucydides*, I, ibid. 1991 (repr. 1992) *ad loc.*; Nep. *Them.* 8-10; cf. Plu. *Them.* 21sqq.

[199] As assumed by Bartoletti (*ad loc.*) and (silently) West (1984, 115; cf. Campbell 1982-1993, IV 93, n. 1). Robertson (1980, 64-65, n. 14), however, suggests that "the passage quoted by the writer περὶ αἴνου...might just come from the same poem as either fr. 2 or fr. 3 [*PMG*]." Wenn Von Leutsch (1874) opposed Schneidewin's application (*GGA* 1837, 858) of Timocreon's Cyprian fable to Themistocles (as the latter is not "weiblichen geschlechts"; see above, Chapter I.III, 5.9, n. 159), the papyrus had yet to be found.

[200] Ps.-Diogenian. διαφυγοῦσαι ~ anon. φ[υγῇ ~ Plu. *Them.* 21 φυγὴν; Ps.-Diogenian. ἐμπεσοῦσαι ~ anon. ἐκ[πεσόν-] I [τος] ~ Plu. *Them.* 23.1 Ἐκπεσόντος.

[201] Cf. Timocr. 727, fr. 1 *PMG ap.* Plu. *Them.* 21: 8 εἰς ὄλεθρον; Themistocles' suicide is related by Plu. ib. 31.

10F2 Timocr. 8, fr. 734 *PMG* *ap.* Ps.-Diogenian. *Praef.* (p. 179 L-S): Fisherman and Octopus (*Aes.* 425)

After having narrated the Carian[202] fable discussed above (Simon. 9F1), Pseudo-Diogenianus (10T2; G28) adds that "Timocreon uses this story [λόγῳ 'fable'[203]] in his songs"[204]; in what form[205] and to what end must remain unclear[206], since neither testimonies nor fragments confirm the paroemiographer's notice.

10A1 Timocr. 3(fr. 729 *PMG*).4-5 *ap.* Plu. *Them.* 21.7, Zen. *cod. Mon.* 525 (I 166 Bühler), Apostol. 7.28 (Arsen. 23.62): Dock-Tailed Fox and Other Foxes (*Aes.* 17)

Plutarch (10T1) quotes the following poem by Timocreon, which is composed in iambic dimeters[207]:

"Well then, Timocreon was not the only man to swear an oath with the Medes; no, there are other rascals too, and I am not the only dock-tailed creature; there are other foxes too."[208]

The last three lines apparently became proverbial: they are included in three paroemiographic collections (10T5-7). One of these (Zenobius') explains the above passage by paraphrasing a fable about a fox who lost his tail when caught by a boy; he was ashamed to appear in public, until he noticed congeners meeting with the same fate. This paraphrase deviates from an Aesopic fable[209], which has the fox lose his tail in a trap and subsequently try, in order to extenu-

---

[202] Perhaps the fable was connected with Timocreon of Ialysos because Rhodos is off Caria.

[203] Lasserre (1984, 88), however, takes this word to be "renvoyant plus probablement à la déclaration du pêcheur perplexe..., qu'à la fable entière".

[204] Translation by Campbell 1982-1993, IV 97.

[205] It is far from sure that Timocreon *imitated* Simonides (contra Adrados 1990, II 311 *ad* Simon. fr. *35 (see above, nn. 172, 178)). He might (conceivably) just have alluded to the fable; cf. Lasserre lc.

[206] Robertson (1980, 62) infers that "Food and drink must have figured rather largely in Timocreon's poems, witness the Carian fisherman who debated whether to dive after the octopus and freeze, or to let it go and see his children starve." But, although, Timocreon was reputed to be a gourmand (Simon. *AP* 7.348 *ap.* Ath. 10, 415F, Thrasym. *ap.* Ath. 10, 416A, Ael. *VH* 1.27; Keydell, R., "Timokreon", *DKP* 5, col. 843), the fisherman is not likely to have been keen on salt water!

[207] Archibald (1912, 58-59), however, scans the poem as a "dactylic hepthemimeral, followed by an iambic dipody, two trochaic dipodies (the first with anacrusis) and a dactylic tripody."

[208] Translation by Robertson 1980, 69.

[209] 17 Hausrath (*Aes.* 17; Adrados 1987a, 45 (to which Leonardo Dati 15 may be added)).

ate the shame, to persuade his congeners to cut off their tails too, those useless and ugly appendices! Whereupon one riposted that, had this not happened to him, he would not have given this advice.

It is clear from Plutarch that the occasion of Timocreon's poem was the same as that of the poem quoted by the anonymous *Περὶ αἴνου* discussed above (10F1): "when Themistocles was accused of medizing, Timocreon composed the following lines against him"[210] (follows the above poem). The key theme of the fable is that of the individual distinguishing itself from its congeners in a disgraceful way. The fox has lost his tail, Timocreon his native country.[211] This correspondence is stressed by a verbal parallel (Οὐκ...μοῦνος ~ οὐκ... μόνα). Besides, Timocreon explicitly equates himself with the "dock-tailed one" (κόλουρις)—a characteristic *kenning*[212], denoting the brushless fox. Both Timocreon and the fox are, or would be, happy to see their companions sharing their lot—company in distress makes sorrow less. Again, a verbal parallel emphasizes the correspondence between Timocreon's and the fox's fellows (ἐντὶ κἆλλοι ~ ἐντὶ καὶ ἄλλαι). It is clear that Zenobius' version fits better with the context of Timocreon's allusion than the one(s) preserved in the fable collections, as in the latter the fox's attempt was unsuccessful, whereas, much to Timocreon's pleasure, Themistocles (and possibly others[213]) did follow his example. However, this is not to say that Timocreon was alluding[214] to some such version as paraphrased by Zenobius: the

---

[210] Translation by Campbell 1982-1993, IV 91. Nevertheless, Archibald (1912, 59) says: "We cannot tell whether the fable was directed at Themistocles or not".

[211] Differently Jedrkiewicz 1989, 332: "Temistocle è divenuto 'lo scodato', dall' astuzia smascherata". Rightly Flacelière, R., *Plutarque.* Vie de Thémistocle, Paris: PUF 1972, 81, usefully comparing Plu. *Flam.* 21 ὥσπερ ὄρνιν...κόλουρον "à propos d'Annibal exilé".

[212] < κόλος (: κλάω) + οὐρά; Wærn 1951, 39: "'stump-tail' = 'fox in the fable'"; contra (curiously enough): Campbell 1982-1993, IV 91, n. 1. Cf. τὴν οὐρὰν ἀφελὼν 10T5 (Zen., typically adding an indefinite place adjunct: ἔν τινι χώρῳ (cf. εἴς τινα τόπον Nic. 3T1a (Σ))); Nic. 3F1.

[213] Robertson (1980, 69-70) suggests that by the plural 'λώπεκες "Timocreon may intend the shifty politicians of Alopece..., who include such reputed medizers as the Alcmaeonids and Aristeides", but see MacDowell 1971, 293 contra a comparable interpretation of ἀλωπεκίζειν in Ar. *V.* 1241-1242 (for which see the Appendix below) by Lewis, D.M., "Cleisthenes and Attica", *Historia* 12, 1963, 23.

[214] Archibald (1912, 58) adduces three reasons why Timocreon only *alludes* to the fable: "it is often the height of art to suggest rather than to portray. Besides this is a defence, and therefore it is the better of brevity... Further, the subject of Medizing was a delicate one, and was all the better of a slight reference." But this is in flat contradiction to Plu. *Them.* 21 (some lines before quoting the fragment under discus-

paroemiographer may have varied the Aesopic fable precisely to eliminate the aforesaid incongruity; moreover, this incongruity between fable and context may be taken to contribute to its satirical function, as it would make Themistocles out to be less smart than the foxes who did not use their dockless congener as a model. However this may be, the allusion has a clear moral overtone: the apers, whom Timocreon compares to foxes, are called "rascals" (πονηροὶ). Of course this implies ironical self-criticism, for they only follow the trend set by Timocreon.

Conclusion

Drawing general conclusions on the function of fables in Greek lyric is greatly hampered by their fragmentary and indirect tradition. Two fables by Archilochus (4F1-2) and one by Semonides (5F1) are incomplete. Another fragment of each of these two poets (4F3, 5F2) may belong to a fable too. Of Stesichorus' and one of Timocreon's fables (10F2) only prose paraphrases exist; the former's authorship can be questioned. Prose paraphrases of Ibycus', Simonides', and another of Timocreon's fables (10F1) may be connected with one extant fragment each. The only complete fable, occurring in a *scolium*, is not self-contained.

The same applies to the contexts of these fables. The direct context of the fables has for the greater part (4F1-2, 10F1) or even completely been lost. The context of the allusions (6A1, 10A1) is complete but very brief. The alleged quondam context of two fables is indicated by paraphrasts (a speech by Stesichorus, an ode by Simonides), who report that they were used on a particular *occasion*, like the *scolia*, which were sung in a social "context".

Therefore, the functions of several fables (Archil. 4F3, Semon. 5F1, Stesich. 7F1, Timocr. 10F2) cannot be ascertained. In another fable (by Simonides) it is clear that the protagonist's and the addressee's situations are analogous, but it is problematic to say to what extent. Yet, despite of this lacunal textual tradition, some (necessarily tentative) conclusions can be drawn with regard to the other fables.

---

sion) πολὺ δ' ἀσελγεστέρᾳ καὶ ἀναπεπταμένῃ μᾶλλον εἰς τὸν Θεμιστοκλέα βλασφημίᾳ κέχρηται μετὰ τὴν φυγὴν αὐτοῦ καὶ τὴν καταδίκην ὁ Τιμοκρέων... [*sequitur* 728, fr. 2 *PMG*].

The two fables told, or alluded to, in the *scolia* resemble fables included in collections in that they (apparently) have a general application; both appropriately deal with the theme of true friendship.

The function of all other fables is specific, though diverse. Both Archilochus (4F1-2) and Timocreon (10F1, 10A1) use two fables to attack some personal rival, menacingly or scoffingly. Three of their fables (4F1-2, 10A1) have foxes as protagonists; it is with these that both poets identify. Their assaults include subtleties: Archilochus' fables contain ambiguities, one in the fable (λεωργὰ 4F1), another in the context (σκυτάλη 4F2); Timocreon's fable may have comprised two *double entendres* (διαφυγοῦσαι, ἐμπεσοῦσαι), his allusion an internal clue (πονηροὶ) and verbal parallels. Archilochus' fables metaphorically represent the poet himself, the addressee and (perhaps) a third party, Timocreon's the poet and/or his target.

One of Stesichorus' fables (7F2) is an aetiology (like Semon. 5F2) which is used to persuade; this very fact exemplifies the genre's flexibility. The fable metaphorically represents the audience, a third and a fourth party. The two major paraphrases have an epimythium, which features verbal parallels. Other devices are also used to interconnect the fable and its context: one version (by Aristotle) continues the metaphor of the fable in its context, the other (by Conon) contains a significant ambiguity (ἐτάραττε) and an internal clue for the evaluation (τὴν ἀδικοῦσαν). According to one, admittedly rather late, testimony, the fable was successful.

Ibycus' fable was apparently identical with Nicander's (3F1); it has the same triple aetiological function, which is again based upon an ambiguous word (γῆρας). One of the fables in the *scolia* (6F1; cf. Timocr. 10F1) is even based upon two such equivocalities (εὐθὺν, σκολιὰ).

It is remarkable that the eagle is twice (Archil. 4F1, Semon. 5F2)[215] depicted as the wrongdoer, whom even Zeus does not protect; however, this is too weak a basis for the modern postulate of the genre's so-called sociological function[216] in Archaic Greek literature.

As for the metre, iambs are most frequent (Archil. 4F1, Semon., Simon., Timocr.), but dactylic (Ibyc.) and complex metres (Archil. 4F2, *Scol.*) occur also.

---

[215] But not in Stesich. 7F1.

[216] See the Conclusion of Chapter I.I above.

TRAGEDY

11. *Aristias*

11F1 Aristias, *TragGrF* I(Snell)9F8: Ass and Snake (*Aes.* 458)
Aelian (11T1) mentions the tragedian[1] Aristias as one of five poets who told the aetiological fable of the Ass and the *Dipsas* (see Ibyc. 8F1; cf. Nic. 3F1). Since no fragments or other testimonies can be combined with Aelian's, it is impossible to say anything about the function of Aristias' version of this fable in its quondam context.

12. *Aeschylus*[2]

12F1 A. *Μυρμιδόνες*, fr. 139 Radt: Eagle and Arrow (*Aes.* 276a)[3]
A scholiast (12T11a), commenting upon a paratragic allusion by Aristophanes (12T1 = 17A4), quotes the following iambic trimeters, which are also cited (twice) in the *Suda* (12T13b and d):

"As follows runs of Libya's famous[4] fables one:
The eagle, whom a bow-shot arrow once had hit,
Spoke, when he saw the arrow was equipped with plumes:
"'T is not by others, but by feathers of our own
That we are caught'"

The above fragment is explicitly called a "fable" (μῦθος[5]) and thus

---

[1] Aelian, however, calls Aristias a comedian; Snell *ad loc.*: "errat Ael. de Aristia poeta 'comico'".

[2] For Stobaeus' ascription (4T21) of Archil. 4F1d to Aeschylus, see the previous chapter, n. 19.

[3] An earlier version of this subsection appeared in *Kleio* (Van Dijk 1993c, 141-144).

[4] κλέος (thus, with Pseudo-Diogenian, Nauck and Radt; Mette (1963, fr. 231) and Werner (1980, fr. 69), with the scholiast on Aristophanes and the *Suda*, prefer λόγος (contra: Nøjgaard 1964, 126).

[5] Not λόγος, as Hausrath (1909, col. 1719) has it, probably misled by the variant reading discussed in the previous note.

demarcated from its context, which has, however, not been preserved. It is the only known specimen of a Libyan fable (see above, Chapter I.III, 5.5); Pseudo-Diogenian (12T6; G28) exemplifies this subspecies by quoting the first line of the above fragment. The fable deviates from the standard type of fable in that there is no real action[6], nor a conflict between two characters[7]: the eagle, upon which the fable focuses, is hit from the very start (πληγέντ' (2) is the first Greek word of the fable proper). Adrados calls this a *fábula de situación*.[8] The eagle's *réplique finale* has become proverbial; it has been used (and varied) more than fifty times by some forty authors for various ends.[9]

Another scholium on Aristophanes (12T11d; Tricl. 12T21c) witnesses that the fable of the eagle occurred in Aeschylus' *Myrmidons*. With *Nereids* and *Phrygians* it formed a tragic trilogy.[10] Of this trilogy only fragments survive. These show that Achilles was the central figure of the trilogy and that this so-called "Achilleid" was a dramatization of epic subject matter. The corresponding books of the *Iliad*[11] enable a tentative reconstruction of the extant fragments. *Myrmidons* in all probability dealt with the peripety in Achilles' attitude: at first he stubbornly refused to fight the temporarily victorious Trojans (frr. 131-134), but when his bosom-friend Patroclus was killed (frr. 135, 137-138) by Hector he was eager for revenge (fr. 140).

Although its context has not been preserved, it is plausible to

---

6 See the Synthesis above; Kurtz (E., *Die bildliche Ausdrucksweise in den Tragödien des Euripides*, Amsterdam 1985, 141), however, assumes that Aeschylus deliberately omits the fable's introduction.

7 See again the Synthesis above. Nøjgaard (1964, 476) seems to confuse Aeschylus' fable with other versions (Aphth. 32, *fab. aes.* 273 Hausrath, *Pa.Bodl.* 7 Chambry (*Aes.* 276)), in which a third character (an archer) is added. Σ *in* Aristid. *Or.* 3.424, and *Tetr.* 1.25 (quoted by Arsen. 13.8 (Apostol. 4.98a) and Erasm. *Adag.* 4.1.96 (p. 990E: "Gabrias")) do have only two; see Van Dijk 1993c, 144-146 (not mentioning Triclinius' paraphrase (12T21c), nor Erasm. lc).

8 Adrados 1979a, 50; see above, Chapter I.I, 1.7.

9 More or less accurate quotations and references: 12T2-3, 12T7-8, 12T10, 12T12, 12T14a, 12T15, 12T17c, 12T19 (D.H. Ph. Aristid. Gal. Ath. Thdr.Stud. (πού τις ἔφη τῶν ἔξω) *Suda* Eust. Tricl. Arsen.). For the numerous instances of the proverb, see Radt *ad loc.* (where Greg. Naz. *Or.* *IV*[a] *c. Jul.* 1.107 might be added); Van Dijk 1993c, 148-149 (omitting Tricl.).

10 Some doubts about this combination are raised by Radt, S., "Der unbekanntere Aischylos", *Prometheus* 12, 1986, 6; cf. Solmsen 1949, 174, n. 211; Taplin, O., "Aeschylean Silences and Silences in Aeschylus", *HSCPh* 76, 1972, 62, n. 17.

11 I, Λ-N, O-Π according to Schadewaldt 1936, 45-48; IΛMO(end)Π according to Mette 1963, 112-113; I, Π-Σ according to Taplin, *art. cit.* 63; Π according to Werner 1980, 757.

assume that the fable of the eagle was part of Achilles' *lamento* at Patroclus' corpse. For the situation of the eagle is analogous to, and can therefore aptly illustrate, that of Achilles: like the eagle, Achilles gains the sad, truly tragic[12] insight that he is the very cause of his own distress[13], since his refusal to fight because of his quarrel with Agamemnon and the permission he gave to Patroclus to enter the battle clad in his armour have led to his beloved friend's death.[14] If this interpretation is correct, the fable is congruous with its context in two other respects: Patroclus is dead, the eagle dying; like the eagle, Achilles sees that his own weapons[15] ultimately appear to have been used against him.

In addition to this interpretation, the first person plural in which the eagle speaks (5 ἁλισκόμεσθα) might not just be taken as *pluralis maiestatis* or as the wording of a general rule[16], but also as a reference to Patroclus, who has brought about his own death: he has himself asked for Achilles' armour and has not obeyed Achilles' command not to go too far but to return on time.[17]

12F2 A. *A.* 717-736: Lion Cub and Man (not in *Aes.*[18])

The second strophic pair of the second stasimon[19] of Aeschylus'

---

[12] Schadewaldt 1936, 59: "eines der tiefsinnigsten Aischylos-Worte uberhaupt".

[13] Thiele (1918, 230) interprets the eagle's *réplique finale* as a boast of Achilles that he is so superior that no one else but he himself can bring about his death. This interpretation, however, is neither in accordance with the tragic context nor with the other versions of the fable (see above, n. 7): cf. *fab. aes.* λύπη (Ib, III), μέμφομαι (Ib), ἐπιβουλή Aphth., παπαῖ *Tetr.* (βαβαί PAld, Arsen., Erasm.).

[14] Porson, R., *Euripidis Medea*, Cambridge 1801; Grauert 1825, 80; Van Leeuwen 1902, 126; Mette 1963, 117; Dohle, B., "Die 'Achilleis' des Aischylos und die attische Vasenmalerei", *Klio* 49, 1967, 88; Werner 1980, 569; Jedrkiewicz 1987, 49. Welcker (F.G., *Die Aeschylische Trilogie Prometheus und die Kabirenweihe zu Lemnos nebst Winken uber die Trilogie des Aeschylus uberhaupt*, Darmstadt 1824, 419) thought that Achilles sadly hinted at his own death, which is improbable because Achilles knows, but at the same time fully accepts, that revenge on Hector will cause his own death, too (cf. Il. 18.115); he does not blame anybody for this, let alone himself.

[15] This is not to join either Burges (1845, 461), taking the arrow by which the eagle is hit to be a reference to Achilles' future death by Paris' arrows, or Wecklein (N., "Über eine Trilogie des Aeschylos und über die Trilogie uberhaupt", *SBAW* 1891.3, 351-352), stating that "das tertium comparationis liegt darin, dass der Feind [Hektor] in der Rustung des Achilleus gegen Achilleus kampft."

[16] Thus Jedrkiewicz 1987, 49.

[17] Il. 16.46-47 and 685-687 (as well as Ar. 17A4) could be adduced in support of this interpretation.

[18] Perry does mention the fable elsewhere (1965, p. XIII, n. 2); see Van Dijk 1994a, 96, 110 n. 5.

[19] For a metrical analysis, see Fraenkel 1950, II 327-328.

Agamemnon is a fable[20] about a man who reared a lion cub[21] in his house. The whelp, at first a harmless pet, developed into a cruel slaughterer. The two phases of this horrible metamorphosis are neatly divided over strophe and antistrophe:

"So, once, was a lion's offspring reared by a man in his house, getting no milk from its mother[22], still fond of the teat, in the prelude of its life tame, a good friend of the children and a delight to the elders[23]; and many a time it was in their arms, like a nursling child, looking bright-eyed to the hand and fawning under the constraint of its belly.

But matured by time it showed the character it had from its parents: for, making a return to those who had reared it, it made ready a feast as an unbidden guest in a horrid slaughter of the flock, and the house was befouled with blood—to the house-folk an agony not to be warded off, a vast havoc wherein many were killed; by the will of the god it had been reared in the house to be a sacrificer in the service of Ate."[24]

The fable is demarcated from its context by the device of ring composition (717-718 ἔθρεψεν...δόμοις ~ 736 δόμοις προσεθρέφθη).[25] Besides, the first line of the fable contains three[26] features typi-

[20] Less fortuitous qualifications: "parable" (Knox 1952, 17; Whallon, W., "The Serpent at the Breast", *TAPhA* 89, 1958, 271-272; Lebeck 1971, 47; Rosenmeyer 1982, 123; Gantz 1983, 80; Hogan 1984, 66; Fowler 1991, 92; Nappa 1994; cf. Enger-Fluss-Gilbert 1895, 63; Mainoldi 1984, 106); "conte animal" (Nojgaard 1964, 443, 505); "metaphor or simile" (Earp 1948, 108; cf. Headlam, W.-Pearson, A.C., *Agamemnon of Aeschylus*, Cambridge: UP 1925, 215; Marr 1970, 55; Adrados 1979a, 156); "allegorie" (Groeneboom 1944, 237; likewise Collard 1975 *ad* E. *Supp.* 1222-1223).

[21] 717-718 λέοντος ἶνιν, Conington's emendation for the λέοντα σίνιν of the MSS (not *vice versa*, as Noldeke (1922, 371, n. 1) has it); cf. Ar. 17A6.1431 λέοντος σκύμνον; Bollack 1982, 2.78-80. According to Noldeke (1922, 376; cf. Brockelmann 1926), referring to Schwartz, the occurrence of a lion points to an Oriental origin of the fable.

[22] ἀγάλακτον. Marino (1975, 77-78) misuses Blomfield's translation "foster-brother" (contra: Fraenkel 1950, II 338) as an argument for an identification of the lion cub with Aegisthus.

[23] Thomson-Headlam (1966, 62; cf. Groeneboom 1944, 238) take this to refer to Il. 3.149-160.

[24] Translation by Fraenkel 1950, I, 133-135.

[25] Knox 1952, 17; Nøjgaard 1964, 443; Lebeck 1971, 48. Both Bury's προσετρίφθη (J.B., "A Correction in *Agamemnon* 735", *CR* 11, 1897, 448-449; cf. Rose 1958, 55) and Campbell's δρόσοις (A.Y., *The Agamemnon of Aeschylus*, Liverpool: UP; London: Hodder & Stoughton 1936, 94) largely spoil the ring composition.

[26] Contra Goldhill (1984, 63), stating that the fable "is introduced merely by οὕτως".

cal of fables: the story-telling οὕτως "once"[27], the unspecified character ἀνήρ "a man"[28], and the anthropomorphism by which the whelp is called a lion's ἶνις "offspring"[29]. The unchangeability of nature is a common fable theme.[30]

The application of the fable within its context, the second choral song of the *Agamemnon*, is twofold. First, the fable of the man who reared a lion cub in his house illustrates the terrible consequences—a divine retribution—of Paris' abduction of Helen to Troy.[31] In vari-

---

[27] 718-719; cf. Ar. *Lys.* 785, Pl. *Phdr.* 237B; Σ *in* Ar. G67a; Fraenkel 1950, II 338-339; Denniston-Page; the Synthesis above. Hoving's objection (1928, 115; also Groeneboom 1944, 237) that this οὕτως should occur earlier in the sentence is rightly attacked by Schuursma (1933, 191). To translate οὕτως by "even so" (thus Weir Smyth, H., *Aeschylus*, II, Loeb, 1926, 63; cf. Enger-Fluss-Gilbert 1895, 62) is less felicitous. Some (like Headlam, W., "Metaphor, with a note on transference of epithets", *CR* 16, 1902, 439) adopt Wecklein's "emendation" (N., *Äschylos Orestie*, I: *Agamemnon*, Leipzig/Berlin: Teubner 1888, 148) βούτας (with 719 ἀνήρ), in order to identify this "shepherd" (hence Verrall (A.W., *The 'Agamemnon' of Aeschylus*, London: MacMillan 1904, 92) proposed οἴτας, which at least meets with Von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff's criticism (U., review of *Praelections...U of Cambridge*, *CR* 20, 1906, 446: "*bubulcum* [-*us*] *oves pascere...nec in Graecia nec opinor in Britannia mons est.*") with Paris (Thomson-Headlam 1966, 62; contra: Schuursma (1933, 190) and Knox (1952, 18-19)) or Aegisthus (Marino 1975, 78; contra: Bollack 1982, 2.72, n. 1).

[28] Cf. *fab. aes.* 5, 28, 30-31, 33-34, 36-37, 42, 278 Hausrath (cf. ib. 32, 35, 264, 284 ἄνθρωπος); Von Wilamowitz-Möllendorff, lc; Fraenkel 1950, II 339; Adrados 1979a, 399; cf. Enger-Fluss-Gilbert 1895, 62; Frangini 1980, 106.

[29] Cf. Archil. 4F1b.1 παῖ]δας, 4F1f παισὶ. This enfeebles Tucker's objection (T.G., *The Supplices of Aeschylus*, London 1889, *ad* A. *Supp.* 42; contra: Bollack 1982, 2.79, n. 1) against Conington's emendation (cf. Fraenkel 1950, II 338, n. 1), that "ἶνις is apparently only used of human beings": Yes indeed, but this is common in fables! Marino (1975, 77) finds the strange solution that "Aegisthus is the lion cub because *inis* here would be used of a *human being* who *was* a lion-cub!"

[30] Adrados (see above, Chapter I.I, 1.7); Cascajero (1991, 50-52; 1992, 57-58); e.g. *Aes.* 393 (Aphth. 6; Them. *Or.* 32, 359bc (Stob. 3.1.122); Greg. Naz. *Adv. Jul.* I 62; *fab. aes.* 274 Hausrath; Synt. 41; *Syr* I, 1, LX, 67; Erpenius 17, 23; cf. three related proverbs: Zen. 1.46; Diogenian. 1.45, V 1.19; Macar. 1.62, 5.50; Apostol. 1.68 (Arsen. 2.14); Adrados 1987a, 257 (including too much (A. 12F2!) and too little).

[31] Cf. Denniston-Page 1957, 135, if somewhat oversophisticatedly arguing that "*the lion-cub's career as a whole* [is compared] with *the whole set of circumstances for which Helen was responsible*, not specifically *the lion-cub* with *Helen herself*"; Bartolini, G., "Il terzo stasimo dell'*Agamennone*", in: *Tetraonyma. Miscellanea Graeca-Romana*, Genova: Istituto di filologia classica e medioevale 1966, 45. Enger-Fluss-Gilbert (1895, 62) identify the lion cub with "das Priamidengeschlecht", Triclinius (12T20d, 12T20mm), Kock (1881, 207), Van Leeuwen (1896, 208), Hoving (1928, 108-116), Whitman (1964, 254) and Nappa (1994, 83, referring to Schulze, F., *De imaginibus et figurata Aeschyli elocutione*, Halberstadt 1854, 18-19; cf. Untersteiner, M., *Eschilo. Le tragedie*, II, Milano: IEL 1947, 292, n. 68; Fowler 1991, 92) with Paris (contra: Schuursma 1933), Marino (1975) with Aegisthus, and Lloyd-Jones (H., *Agamemnon by Aeschylus*, Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall 1970, 56; cf. Nappa 1994, 86, n. 7) with Clytaemnestra.

ous ways it is apparent that this interpretation of the fable is the obvious one. Firstly, the place of the fable[32]: in its immediate context—both before and after the fable (in the first strophic pair and the third strophe, respectively)—the chorus depict the ruin brought to Troy by Helen. Secondly, both Helen's and the lion cub's nature are ambiguous; this is shown, or rather: expressed, by linguistic means: the etymological derivation of her name Ἑλένα from ἑλέναυς[33] in the first strophe and a pun on two meanings of κῆδος[34] in the first antistrophe for Helen, and a chiastic ring composition in the second strophe and antistrophe for the lion cub[35]. By these devices the chorus show that Helen is not what she appears to be at first sight, like the lion cub. Thirdly, both the fable and its immediate context (the first antistrophe and the third strophe) depict a transformation of initial[36] happiness into horror. The reversal is each time indicated by key verbs at the very junctions: 709 μεταμανθάνουσα, 744 παρακλίνασ'[37], 727 χρονισθεὶς. The ultimate ruin is each time presented as divine retribution.[38] Fourthly, verbal parallels connect the ultimate bloodshed as a consequence of Helen's coming to Troy with the horrible deeds of the grown-up lion.[39] Fifthly, the metaphor of the lion cub seems to be echoed in the metaphorical description of Helen[40] as δηξίθυμον[41] ἔρωτος ἄνθος.[42]

---

[32] Cf. Frangini 1980, 107; Gantz 1983, 80.

[33] Aeschylus goes on with ἕλανδρος and ἑλέπτολις; cf. Stanford 1942, 75; Groeneboom 1944, 233; Rosenmeyer 1982, 92.

[34] See LSJ sv (I.3): "*object of care*...with a play on signf. II [*connexion by marriage*]"; Hogan 1984, 66.

[35] 717-718 ~ 735-736: to rear a lion cub in the house means to rear a priest of ruin; Lebeck 1971, 48.

[36] 737 πάραυτα "at first" (Hoving 1928, 114, n. 91 quoting Verrall; Fraenkel 1950, I 135 (cf. Groeneboom 1944, 240)); contra: Thomson-Headlam 1966, 62: "at the time"), not: "likewise" (contra Schuursma, J.A., *De poetica vocabulorum abusione apud Aeschylum*, diss. Utrecht, Amsterdam: Paris 1932, 135, reading παρ' αὐτά) or: "thus" (contra Rosenmeyer 1982, 123; cf. Holzberg 1993 (above, Chapter I.I, 1.9)); contra: Bollack 1982, 2.87-88). Likewise, 718-719 οὕτως does not primarily mean "just so".

[37] Lloyd-Jones (1969, 103), however, believes that "παρακλίνασα here means 'having laid them beside each other,' i.e., 'having put them to bed together.'"

[38] f. ἐκ θεοῦ ~ c. 704 ξυνεστίου Διός, 748 πομπᾷ Διὸς ξενίου.

[39] f. 727 χρονισθείς ~ c. 702 ὑστέρῳ χρόνῳ (cf. Frangini 1980, 106); f. 732 αἵματι ~ c. 698 αἱματόεσσαν, 716 αἷμ'.

[40] Lloyd-Jones (1969, 101), however, takes 741-743 "to refer to...Love."

[41] Cf. Sansone 1975, 11: "the metaphor of the bite of the wild beast"; Dumortier 1935, 128: "dévorant"; differently (but narrowing the metaphorical gap between δηξίθυμον and ἄνθος) Mazon, P., *Eschyle*, II, Budé, 1925, 36: "qui enivre les cœurs".

[42] In addition, Winnington-Ingram (R.P., *Studies in Aeschylus*, Cambridge...: UP 1983, 207) regards 746 δύσεδρος καὶ δυσόμιλος "as a clear reference back to the fable".

However, this one interpretation does not fully account for the function of the fable in its context. Obvious verbal parallels between, and synonyms in, the fable and the remainder of the second stasimon[43] (the third antistrophe and the fourth strophic pair) indicate that the fable of the lion cub also illustrates, more abstractly, that one impious act (ὕβρις) will beget more ruinous deeds of its like, which in the *Oresteia* is exemplified by the house of Atreus: Orestes will exact vengeance upon Clytaemnestra and Aegisthus who exacted vengeance upon Agamemnon who killed Iphigeneia.[44] The very wording of

---

[43] f. 727-728 ἀπέδειξεν ἦθος τὸ πρὸς τοκέων ~ c. 760 σφετέρᾳ δ' εἰκότα γέννᾳ, 772 εἰδομέναν (εἰδομένας Casaubon; cf. Bollack 1982, 2.114-116) τοκεῦσιν; f. 730 ἄταις (Rose (1958, 55) adopts Schneider's "palmary" μάταισιν, whereas Paley (F.A., *The Tragedies of Aeschylus*, London: Whittaker/Bell 1879⁴, 404), discussing Hermann's ἀγαισιν and ἄγαισιν, as well as Kennedy's θανάτοισιν, prefers Conington's and Malden's ἄσαισιν), 735-736 ῎Ατας ~ c. 771 ῎Ατας; f.c. 733, 769 ἄμαχον (cf. Enger-Fluss-Gilbert 1895, 65); f. 718, 736 δόμοις, 733 οἰκέταις ~ c. 761 οἴκων, 771 μελάθροισιν, 774 δώμασιν; f. 717 ἔθρεψεν, 721 εὐφιλόπαιδα, 724 νεοτρόφου τέκνου, 729 τροφεῦσιν, 736 προσεθρέφθη ~ c. 754 τεκνοῦσθαι μηδ᾽ ἄπαιδα θνᾴσκειν, 756 βλαστάνειν, 759 τίκτει, 760 γέννᾳ, 762 καλλίπαις (cf. Dumortier 1935, 195), 764 τίκτειν, 772 τοκεῦσιν; f. 727 χρονισθείς ~ c. 766-767 ὅτε τὸ κύριον μόλῃ φάος; f. 724 νεοτρόφου ~ c. 764-765 νεάζουσαν; f. 724 δίκαν (missing from Earp's list (1948, 141-142); cf. Gagarin 1976, 66, 189, n. 32) ~ c. 761 εὐθυδίκων, 773 Δίκα. Some of these parallels are mentioned by Knox (1952, 18) and Bollack (1982, 2.113).

[44] This is not to say that the lion cub *stands for* Agamemnon, Clytaemnestra, Aegisthus, and Orestes, as Knox (1952; contra: Adrados 1965a, 2; Frangini 1980, 107, n. 14) and, in his wake, Lebeck (1971, 50-51; cf. Gantz 1983, 80-81 with n. 50; Goldhill 1984, 63; Easterling 1989a, 141-142; Fowler 1991, 92 (adding Electra); Nappa 1994, 85) hold, adducing all passages in the entire trilogy (notably *A.* 1224, 1258-1259; *Eu.* 193; more implicitly (still less obviously) *Ch.* 749sqq, *Eu.* 355-356) in which some lion occurs (cf. Fowler, B.H., "Aeschylus' Imagery", *C&M* 28, 1967, 37 and Hogan 1984, 66, who, respectively, replace Clytaemnestra, Aegisthus and Orestes with the Argive host and Paris). However, these alleged *Fernbeziehungen* are hardly compatible not only with the original function of the trilogy as a *drama* meant to be delivered to, and understood by, an audience, but also (cf. Bollack 1982, 2.65-70) with the incongruities between the fable and the alleged pendants. These references to lions are better seen as instances of the use of a dominant (or: recurrent) image (see Garson, R.W., "Observations on Some Recurrent Metaphors in Aeschylus' *Oresteia*", *AClass* 26, 1983, 33-34 (cf. Gagarin 1976, 70) and, in general, Stanford 1942, 96-100), which is especially apt for the Atreidae (Headlam), and of which the fable of the lion cub is just another example. The audience is not likely to spontaneously call persons to mind, who are nowhere mentioned in the context nor present on stage (although Thomson-Headlam (1966, I 63-64) think 748-749 νυμφόκλαυτος Ἐρινύς to allude to Clytaemnestra, "mourning for Iphigeneia" and probably entering "at this point" (cf. Denniston-Page 1957, 137-138; contra: Taplin 1977, 300-301, n. 4), and although Conacher (1987, 27) states that 725 φαιδρωπὸς "echoes Clytemnestra's own description of herself at v 520" and even that 731 δαῖτ' ἀκέλευστος ἔτευξεν "reminds us of Atreus' awful banquet for Thyestes").

the fable points to this second interpretation: the lion cub is reared "in the house", a central notion in both the trilogy[45] and the fable[46]; the last lines of the fable (732-736) seem to bear as well (or even more) on the application[47]: "the house was befouled with blood—to the house-folk an agony not to be warded off, a vast havoc wherein many were killed; by the will of the god it had been reared in the house to be a sacrificer in the service of Ate."

Agamemnon's entrance[48]—just after the second stasimon—is doomed. The chorus' greeting words seem to point back once again to the fable of the lion cub by continuing its metaphor (791 δῆγμα ~ 742 δηξίθυμον; 795 προβατογνώμων ~ 730 μηλοφόνοισι; 798 σαίνειν ~ 725-726 σαίνων)[49]: the chorus try to warn him to distinguish appearance from reality[50] (as the man in the fable should have done with his pet).

Thus the fable points towards, and thereby interconnects, the past (the ruin of Troy) and the future (the ruin of the house of Atreus) at a significant moment of the tragedy: the entrance of Agamemnon.

13. *Sophocles*[51]

13F1 S. *Aj.* 1142-1146: Man and Sailors (*Aes.* T72)[52]

In Sophocles' *Ajax* the following fable[53] occurs:

"In the past I have seen a man of reckless speech urging sailors to

---

[45] Gagarin 1976, 58; cf. Di Benedetto, V., "La casa, il démone e la struttura dell'*Oresteia*", *RFIC* 112, 1984, 385-406.

[46] 718, 736 δόμοις, 732 οἶκος (misinterpreted by Enger-Flüss-Gilbert 1895, 63 as "sogar den Wohnraum der Menschen"), 733 οἰκέταις.

[47] Cf. Conacher (1987, 28), who, however, applies the lines to Helen and Troy.

[48] Analysed by Taplin 1977, 302-306; cf. Herington, J., *Aeschylus*, New Haven/ London: Yale UP 1986, 113. Kitto (H.D.F., *Greek Tragedy. A Literary Study*, London: Methuen 1950² (repr. 1966), 74) implicitly compares Cassandra's coming with Agamemnon to Helen's coming to Troy "as a lion-cub".

[49] Cf. Sansone 1975, 11; Lebeck 1971, 50-51.

[50] Cf. 788 τὸ δοκεῖν εἶναι, 797 τὰ δοκοῦντ'.

[51] See also below, S. 14F1, 24A1.

[52] Perry (1965, p. XIII, n. 3) did consider the passage to be a fable; see Van Dijk 1994a, 96, 110 n. 7.

[53] "parable": Jebb, R.C., *Sophocles*, VII: *The Ajax*, Cambridge 1896 (repr. Amsterdam 1962), 174; Perry (!) 1940, 396; Stanford 1963b, 279; Holt 1981, 284; Segal 1981, 148; "anecdote": Nøjgaard 1964, 91; "riddle[s]": Burton 1980, 35 (see below, n. 58); likewise Untersteiner 1956, 206, adducing Σ *in* 1127. De Romilly (1976, 102) compares Plu. *Mor.* 128B.

sail during a storm. But one heard no word from him when he was in the grip of the storm's attack; he huddled up under his cloak and allowed any sailor who wished to trample on him."[54]

The first line contains two elements which are common in fables: the indefinite temporal adjunct ποτ' "once"[55], and the unspecified protagonist ἀνήρ "a man" (as in A. 12F2)[56]. The claim of autopsy (εἶδον) is less typical of fables[57] than of riddles[58], but seems to be meant especially to heighten the trustworthiness of the fable: it is thus presented as having actually happened instead.

The fable is told by Menelaus to Teucer, who insists that his brother Ajax be buried, which Atreus' son forbids.[59] Immediately before the fable, the two adversaries have plainly[60] expressed their opinions at the end[61] of their *agon*.[62] In the fable's epimythium Menelaus makes very clear that by the "man" of the fable Teucer is meant (1147-1149):

"Just so shall a small cloud issue in a mighty tempest that shall blow upon you and your loud mouth and put a stop to all your shouting."

---

[54] I.e. got seasick; Kamerbeek 1953, 221; Stanford 1963b, 202. Translations in this and the next subsection are by Lloyd-Jones, H., *Sophocles*, I, Loeb, 1994, 139. 1146 is quoted by Syn. 13T1.

[55] See the Synthesis above.

[56] Cf. τις...l...χειμών in the epimythium (see below).

[57] *Gesta Rom.* 51 Oesterley combines the same three elements: *Vidi...quandoque hominem*; cf. Jac. Vitr. 91, 103 Greven: *Vidi quendam...* (cf. ib. 75 *novi*; 63 *transivi*; 84, 97-99 *memini*; *passim*: *audivi*).

[58] Cf. Cleobulina fr. 1 West *ap.* Ath. 10.76, 452B; cf. Arist. *Rh.* 3.2 (1405b1), *Po.* 22 (1458a29); Demetr. *Eloc.* 102; Syr. *in* Hermog. (I 36 Rabe); Jo. Sicel. *in* Hermog. (VI 200 Walz); Plu. *Mor.* 154B. Cf. Kamerbeek 1953, 221; Karadagli 1981, 20, n. 1. This is not to say that "the contestants pose riddles to each other", as Burton (1980, 35) asserts.

[59] For an analysis of the so-called "burial debates", see, e.g., Holt 1981, 281-288; Davidson, J.F., "Sophoclean Dramaturgy and the Ajax Burial Debates", *Ramus* 14, 1985, 16-29; Blundell 1989, 88-95.

[60] Eicken Iselin (E., *Interpretationen und Untersuchungen zum Aufbau der Sophokleischen Rheseis*, Diss. Dortmund: Ruhfus 1942, 209) observes that this is "unter Umkehrung der sonst ublichen Reihenfolge (von Verhullung und Klärung)", and also points to the fable's "Affektcharakteristik".

[61] 1140-1141; cf. March 1991-1993, 28.

[62] De Romilly (1976, 102) contends: "L'emploi de l'apologue n'est pas rare dans les débats tragiques", although the two in the *Ajax* are the only ones to survive. Segal's remark (1981, 148) that "the parable form itself reflects Menelaus's disdain" rather reflects the author's disdain for the fable form.

The typical introductory formula[63] of the epimythium expressly indicates that it is Teucer who is represented in the fable. Like the man in the fable, Teucer talks big[64] but will not dare open his mouth when the situation becomes precarious[65]. The image of the storm from the fable is conspicuously continued in the epimythium: σμικροῦ νέφους τάχ' ἄν τις ἐκπνεύσας μεγὰς χειμὼν[66] κατασβέσειε. By this device the fable is the closer linked with its context. Conversely, the context also seems to intrude into the fable: the sailors in the fable are likely to have reminded the audience of the chorus, consisting of Ajax's crew[67].

The fable is also connected with its context in a wider sense: the play[68] in which it occurs, particularly with the themes of madness and knowledge. The storm, the dominant image of the fable, often symbolizes madness, *in casu* Ajax's[69]; nautic and storm metaphors are recurrent in the play[70] (and in the fable). Moreover, throughout the play verbs expressing visual perception are used for the acquisition of knowledge.[71] Finally, in the fable and the epimythium two adjectives

[63] 1147 οὕτω δὲ καὶ σὲ; see above, Stesich. 7F2, n. 151.

[64] 1142 γλώσσῃ θρασὺν ~ 1118 τοιαύτην γλῶσσαν, 1124 ἡ γλῶσσά σου, 1147 τὸ σὸν λάβρον στόμα; cf. Segal 1981, 135.

[65] 1144-1145 ᾧ φθέγμ' ἂν οὐκ ἂν ηὗρες, ἡνίκ' ἐν κακῷ | χειμῶνος εἴχετ' ~ 1148-1149 μέγας | χειμὼν κατασβέσειε τὴν πολλὴν βοήν.

[66] 1149 ~ 1143 and 1145 χειμῶνος; Kamerbeek 1953, 222. Stanford (1963b, 203 (and 195-196)) observes that "the notion of great results emerging from small origins" occurs also in 1077-1078 and 1253-1254 (cf. *Ant.* 477-478 and *El.* 415-416). It will be noted that the opposite position of σμικροῦ and μέγας in 1148 illustrates their semantic relation.

[67] 1143 ναύτας, 1146 ναυτίλων ~ 201 ναὸς ἀρωγοὶ τῆς Αἴαντος, 349 ναυβάται, 357-358 γένος ναΐας ἀρωγὸν τέχνας, | ἅλιον ὃς ἐπέβας ἑλίσσων πλάταν, 565 ἐνάλιος λεώς; Burton 1980, 6.

[68] The unity of the play has recently been advocated by Tyrrell (W.B., "The Unity of Sophocles' *Ajax*", *Arethusa* 18, 1985, 155-185) and Eucken (Chr., "Die thematische Einheit des Sophokleischen 'Aias'", *WJA n.s.* 17, 1991, 119-133), both with further literature on this much-debated issue.

[69] ~ 207, 351-352; Lahmer 1984, 179, 181, 189; cf. Winnington-Ingram 1980, 51.

[70] 35, 251, 1329; 206-207, 257-258, 351-353, 558-559, 674-675, 682-683, 889, 1081-1083; Stanford 1963b, 274-275; Segal 1981, 121-123; Jedrkiewicz 1989, 357, n. 38.

[71] 1142 εἶδον ~ 125, 360, 386, 1026; cf. 1, 3, 6, 127; see Simpson, M., "Sophocles' Ajax: His Madness and Transformation", *Arethusa* 2, 1969, 89-90, 99 n. 9; cf. Lahmer 1984, 175.

(θρασύς and μέγας[72]) and one noun (ἀνήρ[73]) occur which are often used as epithets of, or in connection with, Ajax.

13F2 S. *Aj.* 1150-1156: Man, Neighbours, Somebody (*Aes.* T72)[74]

Teucer fights Menelaus with his own weapons[75] and retorts with the following fable[76]:

"And I have seen a man full of stupidity, who harried others in their time of troubles. And then a man like me and of the same temper saw him, and spoke such words as these: 'Fellow, do not persecute the dead; for if you do so, know that you shall suffer pain!' That was how he rebuked the miserable man directly;"

Teucer's fable echoes, and outdoes[77], Menelaus' in several respects. First, on a formal level, the former uses the same protagonist as the latter, viz. the typically fabulistic unspecified ἀνήρ "a man" (1150, 1156; a kind of ring composition[78]), but at the same time he adds another anonymus (1152 τις) as the typical *survenant*[79]; besides, Teucer replaces Menelaus' typical time adjunct (ποτ'; transposed to 1158) with another one of equal length (1152 κᾆτ'), which is equally typical, albeit of another stage in the narrative: it often introduces the final, decisive event(s) or word(s)[80]. Moreover, Teucer surpasses Menelaus' boast of autopsy (1150 ὄπωπα instead of εἶδον; cf. 1158 ὁρῶ).[81]

---

[72] 364; 154, 158, 160, 161, 169, 205, 502, 617, 713; Knox, B.M.W., "The *Ajax* of Sophocles", *HSCPh* 65, 1961, 21; March 1991-1993, 12; cf. Stanford 1963b, p. XXVII, n. 37; Winnington-Ingram 1980, 22, n. 35; Segal 1981, 113.

[73] 9, 77, 119, 220, 222, 228, 271, 320, 324, 332, 337, 344, 410, 1332; cf. 1238; Stanford 1963b, 66, 103; March 1991-1993, 12 with n. 67. But cf. above (n. 56).

[74] Cf. Perry 1965, p. XIII, n. 3; Van Dijk 1994a, 96, 110 n. 7; above, n. 52.

[75] Jedrkiewicz (1989, 358) observes: "...un racconto...è inconfutabile [cf. Nicol. G64c]; si può solo cercare di cancellarlo rispondendovi con altra narrazione;..." Cf. 13T2a (Σ) καὶ οὗτος αἰνίττεται.

[76] "parable": Perry (!) 1940, 399; Stanford 1963b, 279; Long, A.A., *Language and Thought in Sophocles. A study of abstract nouns and poetic technique*, London 1968, 107; Holt 1981, 284; "anecdote": Nøjgaard 1964, 91; "riddle[s]": Gellie 1972, 24; Burton 1980, 35 (cf. Segal 1981, 148).

[77] Bowra (C.M., *Sophoclean Tragedy*, Oxford: Clarendon P 1944 (repr. 1965), 54), however, emphasizes that the two fables "are constructed on similar lines"; cf. Untersteiner 1956, 206, comparing the "corrispondenza antistrofica dei canti corali". Differently Campbell, L., *Sophocles*, II, Oxford: Clarendon P 1881, 100.

[78] 1150 ἄνδρ'...μωρίας πλέων, 1156 ἄνολβον ἄνδρ'.

[79] Fraenkel 1920, 369 (Karadagli 1981, 22); see the Synthesis above.

[80] Fraenkel 1920, 367-368; cf. Nøjgaard 1964, 227-228.

[81] Kamerbeek 1953, 222; contra: Fraenkel, E., *Due seminari romani. Aiace e Filottete di Sofocle*, Roma 1977, 35.

The meaning of Teucer's fable is unmistakable: his fable, unlike Menelaus', is hardly metaphorical[82], since Teucer calls a spade a spade. In the fable he explicitly resembles himself to the *survenant*[83], and in the epimythium he equates Menelaus with the fool of the fable (1157-1158):

"and I see that man, and he is, I think, none other than you. Do I speak in riddles?"

The comparison Teucer draws between himself and the *survenant* seems to make the use of the word λόγος (1153) equivocal: it may be taken to refer not only to the "word(s)" spoken by the *survenant*, but also to the very "fable" Teucer is telling, as λόγος has been seen above (Chapter I.III, 1.2) to be the common designation for the genre in the Classical Period.[84]

The *survenant*'s advice to the fool in the fable, not to harm the dead, obviously bears on Teucer's plea to Menelaus, not to deny a burial to Ajax[85]. Both Menelaus and the protagonist of the fable are called "a mad man"[86], and both are accused of *hybris*[87]. Two participles in the fable (1152 εἰσιδών, 1156 παρών) grammatically go with the *survenant* but also apply to Teucer, who actually faces his opponent. Moreover, the situations in the fable and in the drama are the same: fable characters and *dramatis personae* alike find themselves "in the midst of woes" (1118, 1151 ἐν κακοῖς[88]).

The function of Teucer's fable is explicitly threefold: admonishing (1156 ἐνουθέτει), critical—the behaviour of the man in the fable who stands for Menelaus is thrice firmly condemned[89]—and threatening[90].

---

[82] Cf. Kamerbeek 1953, 222; Untersteiner 1956, 207; Stanford 1963b, 203. This is neither to say that "Teucer's attempt to use it [the fable form] is characteristically incompetent", nor that Teucer "uses forthright speech", as Winnington-Ingram (1980, 64, n. 21) and Segal (1981, 148) state, respectively.

[83] 1152-1153 ...τις ἐμφερὴς ἐμοὶ | ὀργὴν θ' ὅμοιος...

[84] Compare the use of μῦθος in Pl. 49A1 below, as well as λέγε in Ar. 17F3.

[85] F. 1154 (cf. Segal 1981, 148); c. (Teucer) 1009-1010, 1131, 1141, 1183-1184; (Menelaus) 1047-1048, 1062-1065, 1089-1090, 1140.

[86] 1150 ἄνδρ'...μωρίας πλέων, 1156 ἄνολβον ἄνδρ' ~ 1162 ἀνδρὸς ματαίου (cf. Hösle, V., *Die Vollendung der Tragödie im Spätwerk des Sophokles. Ästhetisch-historische Bemerkungen zur Struktur der attischen Tragödie*, Stuttgart: frommann-holzboog 1984, 104).

[87] 1151 ὕβριζε ~ 1092 ὑβριστής; cf. Lefèvre 1991, 114.

[88] Compare Menelaus' metaphorical description of the situation: ἐν κακῷ | χειμῶνος (1143-1144).

[89] 1150 μωρίας πλέων, 1151 ὕβριζε, 1156 ἄνολβον.

[90] 1155; cf. Dalmeyda, G., "Sophocle, AJAX", *REG* 46, 1933, 12.

The final question (1158 μῶν ᾐνιξάμην;) is rhetorical, as Teucer's fable is unmistakably clear. At the same time, it ironically refers to the riddle-like appearance of both fables.[91]

Like Menelaus' fable, Teucer's is also connected with its context in a wider sense, viz. the play, by the recurrent themes of madness and knowledge. The man in the fable is twice called mad[92]. Thus, Ajax, with whose greatness Teucer's and Menelaus' petty quarrelling contrasts meagrely[93], appears to be not the only mad one. Its counterpart, knowledge, is present in the *verbum videndi*, which is, as elsewhere[94], used for intellectual activity, and through which Teucer presents himself as omniscient.

Both opponents' reaction to each other's fable is explicitly reported: Menelaus finds it "disgraceful" (αἰσχρόν) to wrangle only with words[95]; *exit* Menelaus (1159-1160). Like in the fable and several times in the preceding altercation[96], Teucer again provokingly imitates his rival but adds a little extra: he calls after him that it is "most disgraceful" (αἴσχιστον) "to listen to a mad man's idle words" (1161-1162). The chorus side with Teucer (1163-1167) and urge him to bury Ajax, for which Teucer makes preparations; *exit* Teucer (1168-1184).

Conclusion

Both in Aeschylus' and in Sophocles' tragedies two complete fables can be found. The fable in *Agamemnon* is the only one to occur in a choral ode; the other three, being composed in iambic trimeters, were spoken.

---

[91] ᾐνιξάμην ~ αἶνος; see above, Chapter I.III, 1.1; n. 58; Kamerbeek 1953, 223; Stanford 1963b, 203. This is not to say that Sophocles calls his fables αἶνοι, as Kovacs (1950, 21) asserts.

[92] 1150 ἄνδρ'...μωρίας πλέων, 1156 ἄνολβον ἄνδρ' (cf. Lefèvre 1991, 114); cf. 1162 ἀνδρὸς ματαίου; Lahmer 1984, 189. In addition, one might compare the man's and Ajax's ὀργή (for which see Camerer, R., *Zorn und Groll in der Sophokleischen Tragödie*, Borna-Leipzig: Noske 1936, 58): 1153 ὀργήν ~ 640 ὀργαῖς; Schneidewin, F.W.-Nauck, A.-Radermacher, L., *Sophokles*, I, Berlin: Weidmann 1913, 160.

[93] Kamerbeek 1953, 13; Stanford 1963b, pp. XLIVsqq; Gellie 1972, 24; Holt 1981, 282; Seale 1982, 170; Bergson, L., "Der 'Aias' des Sophokles als 'Trilogie'", *Hermes* 114, 1986, 42; March 1991-1993, 13.

[94] 1150 ὄπωπα; cf. 1152 εἰσιδών, 1157 ὁρῶ; above, n. 71.

[95] Cf. Winnington-Ingram 1980, 66; Segal 1981, 135.

[96] 1126-1127, 1128-1129, 1132-1133, 1140-1141; Stanford 1963b, 203.

Setting aside Aristias' fable, whose function cannot be ascertained, and making a reservation in view of the fragmentary transmission of *Myrmidons*, we may say that the two tragic fable pairs and their functions are remarkably similar. Aeschylus' two fables oppose some fierce animal (the kings of birds and beasts, respectively) and a human being (if only implicitly in *Myrmidons*); one (the raptor) has the worst, the other (the predator) prevails. The two Sophoclean fables have exclusively human protagonists. Both of Aeschylus' fables seem to be key passages of the tragedies in which they occur, illustrating the tragic relations between the principal *dramatis personae*. The function of both fables is bipartite, a first, obvious application being supplemented by a second, somewhat less obvious one.

Sophocles' two fables, occurring consecutively in one tragedy, have a different, more dramatic function, constituting a kind of fable battle as culmination of an *agon*. The addressee of the first fable is the narrator of the second, and the first narrator the second addressee; the second fable echoes and surpasses the first. The two fables are presented as riddles which are solved by their narrators in an epimythium (which Aeschylus' fables lack). Both Sophoclean fables can be connected with themes central to the play; one of them even uses its dominant imagery and furthermore features, like the *Agamemnon* fable (if on a less grand scale), intrusion of the fable into its context, and *vice versa*.

SATYR PLAY

14. *Sophocles*[1]

14F1 S. *Κωφοί*, fr. 362 Radt *ap.* Ael. *NA* 6.51, Σ *in* Nic. *Ther.* 343-354: Ass and Snake (*Aes.* 458)

Aelian (14T1) includes Sophocles among the classical poets who told the aetiological fable of the Ass and the *Dipsas* (Ibyc. 8F1). The fable occurred in his satyr play *Κωφοί*, witness a scholium (14T2) on Nicander's version of this fable (3F1). Of this satyr play only a few fragments[2] survive. Its title can be translated by "Blockheads"[3] and probably refers to the chorus[4]. One can hypothetically[5] connect this interpretation of the title and the scholiast's testimony: it is possible that the satyrs were called "blockheads" because the play represented *them* as the ones who were so foolish as to lose the drug against immortality, granted to them by Zeus for reporting Prometheus' theft of fire: they loaded the drug onto an ass, who gave it to a serpent who guarded a well[6] from which he wanted to drink. In this hypothesis[7]

[1] See also above, S. 13F1-2; below, S. 24A1.

[2] 362-366 Radt, cf. ib. 226 (but cf. below, n. 6), 844, 921, 923; A. fr. 207 Radt according to Bates 1934, 170-171 (see the Appendix below). It might be remarked that another "ass" mentioned in the play (fr. 363 Radt *ap.* Σ *in* A.R. 1.972a: ὄνος ἰσόπριος) is a (wood-)louse (see Arist. *HA* 5.31, 557a23; Thphr. *HP* 4.3.6; Hsch. σ 511 Schmidt; LSJ svv ἰσόσπριος and ὄνος (III)).

[3] Pearson 1917, II 31 (contra Welcker), referring to Hsch. sv κωφόν and Σ *in* S. *Aj.* 911; Bates 1934, 167; cf. LSJ, sv κωφός (II 5; Drury, M., in: Easterling-Knox 1989, I 2, 181): "'the Dullards'".

[4] Cf. Taplin 1972, 63, n. 17 (referring to Haigh): "A collective plural [in the title of a play] should be taken to give the identity of the chorus, unless there is very strong evidence to the contrary..."

[5] Cf. Bates (1934, 172-173; 1940, 225), whose fanciful reconstruction is overconfident. According to Radt (S., "Sophokles in seinen Fragmenten", in: De Romilly 1983, 195), the subject matter is "unklar".

[6] This is not to say that Hartung was right in transferring fr. 226 Radt τρέφουσι κρήνης φύλακα χωρίτην ὄφιν from *Ἡρακλῆς* to *Κωφοί*.

[7] Sutton (D.F., "The Satyr Play", in: Easterling-Knox 1989, I.2, 99) points to a parallel: both "Sophocles' *Iambe* [fr. 731 Radt (*fab. inc.*)] and *Kophoi* present variants of the theme of loss of immortality through folly."

the fable is staged and occupies a central place in the drama. However this may be, the subject of an ass carrying a rejuvenating drug[8] and a snake whose bite causes an unquenchable thirst[9] seems apt for a satyr play.

15. *Achaeus*

15A1 Achae.[10] *Ὀμφάλη*, *TragGrF* I(Snell)20F34 *ap.* Menedemum Eretr. *ap.* D.L. 2.17 (133), Erasm. *Adag.* 1.7.68: Tortoise/Turtle and Eagle (cf. *Aes.* 226?)

Diogenes Laertius (15T2) preserves the following two iambic trimeters from Achaeus' satyr play *Ὀμφάλη*:

"the rapid one was even caught by weak ones, then,
just as the eagle by the tortoise in a wink."

In the second line of this fragment (translated into Latin by Erasmus (15T3)) Achaeus probably alludes to a fable about a tortoise and an eagle[11]. The exact content of this fable, however, cannot be retrieved with certainty. For an identification with any of the existing fables[12] in which these two characters occur is out of the question, since in these fables—and in the anecdote about Aeschylus' tragic death[13]—the eagle kills the tortoise by dropping him from the air onto a stone (as eagles are wont to do), whereas in the fragment at hand the latter somehow beats the former. Possibly Achaeus alludes to some variant of the widespread "Wettlauffabel"[14], in which a slow

---

[8] Cf. Sutton lc: a "frequent narrative element is magic and the miraculous", which "may also be seen as aspects of a more general tendency to employ elements reminiscent of *Märchen* and fairy tales."

[9] One might easily imagine the satyrs trying to slake their thirst by wine instead of water.

[10] Crönert (1906, 10), comparing Dionys. (impersonating Sophocles) *Παρθενοπαῖος ap.* D.L. 5.6 (92-93), considers the attribution to Achaeus to be "sehr verdachtig".

[11] Cf. Keller 1861-1867, 383.

[12] *Aes.* 230: Babr. 115, Avian. 2 (compared by Fiocchi 1982, 253-266), *fab. aes.* 259 Hausrath, *fab. dact.* 11 Crusius, *Tetr.* 1.40; cf. Hunger 1966, 262, n. 1. *Aes.* 490: Phaedr. 2.6, Rom. 17 Thiele. Adrados (1987a, 246-247, 429 (medieval versions)) subsumes these two fables under one heading. I did not see Puntoni, V., *La favola esopica dell'aquila e della testuggine*, Bologna 1912.

[13] An eagle is said (Ael. *NA* 7.16; Val. Max. 9.12) to have mistaken the tragedian's bald head for a stone.

[14] Cf. Neubner (1889, 34) and Wienert (1925, 44, n. 3), who only mention *Aes.* 226.

animal beats a fast one in a race. In the numerous versions of this fable which occur throughout the world the animals and the method by which the victory is gained may vary: the slow animal wins[15] either (1) because he keeps on moving while his opponent self-confidently falls asleep, or (2) by stealing a ride on the back of his rival and making a bolt for the finish, or (3) by using a double.[16] In extant Greek literature the version of this fable in which a Tortoise outruns a Hare[17] (or a Horse[18]) through the first[19] method is most frequent, whereas another version in which a Wren beats an Eagle by means of the second method occurs only once, in Plutarch[20]; yet another, and the earliest extant Greek[21], version, in which two Hedgehogs beat a Hare by applying the third method, appears to be illustrated on the so-called Northampton vase[22]. The fable alluded to by Achaeus might be some such combination of these three versions and methods: it combines the typical Tortoise and Plutarch's Eagle, whereas the third method[23] seems appropriate to win the prize. The combination of a land animal and a bird seems somewhat strange, the more so since most other versions of this fable oppose two animals of the same kind (element). It is also, however, possible that the eagle's adversary is a *marine* animal (in which case "turtle" would be a more

[15] Two modern fabulists have the *fast* animal win, unexpectedly after all (Thurber, J., *Fables for Our Time...*, New York: Harper & Row 1939, 1940 (repr. 1983), 61; Ross 1964, nr. XX); other "anti-fable" [see below, Demad. 41F1, n. 107] versions are discussed by Carnes 1992, 11-14.

[16] See the variants collected by Dähnhardt 1912, 46-97.

[17] *Fab. aes.* 254 Hausrath (*Aes.* 226) I, cf. IIIγ; *Cod. Branc.* IV A 5, no. 3 (foll. 108r-108v); *Pa. Bodl.* 353 Chambry; *Dod.* ibid.; *Syr.* XLIII Lefèvre; Tz. *H.* 7.77-79 (105), *Ep.* 13 (p. 23 Leone).

[18] Lib. *Prog.* 1.2, *Or.* 62.44 (IV 368 Foerster); Simp. *in Ph.* 6.9 (*CAG* 10, 1014), comparing Achilles' paradoxical unability to outrun a tortoise (Zeno Eleat. *ap.* Arist. *Ph.* Z 9, 239b14); Chor. 18(*Dial.* 10).5 (p. 222 Foerster-Richtsteig).

[19] In Tz. *Ep.* 13, however, it is apparent from ἡ χελώνη...δόλοις λαθραίοις νικήσασα and τὸ τῆς χελώνης οὖν κακομήχανον that the tortoise used the second or third method.

[20] *Mor.* 806EF (*Aes.* 434).

[21] Apart from the Mycenaean lime plate referred to by Crusius 1913, p. LXIII.

[22] The Fox umpires (like in *fab. aes.* (IIIγ)). Illustration in Simon, E., *Die griechischen Vasen. Aufnahmen von Max und Albert Hirmer*, Munchen: Hirmer 19812, pp. XVI-XVII; commentary (not referring to the fable) ib. 61-62. See Crusius 1879, 222; Bolte-Polívka 1912-1932, III 346.

[23] Erasmus' paraphrase of Menedemus' application (15T3; 53T2) of the distich suggests that he holds the first method possible, too: *ubi quis potentiorem arte vincit, & quod viribus non potest, assiduitate conficit.*

accurate translation).[24] This is suggested by comparing an Old Siamese variant of the *Panchatantra*, in which a turtle beats Khruth (Vishnu's Garuda) in a seemingly hopeless simultaneous air- and water-race by deploying a host of allied congeners.[25] But, whether Achaeus' eagle was beaten by a tortoise or by a turtle, animals from different elements are opposed all the same. The opposition between "rapid" and "weak" in the comparison in the first line of the distich is incongruous in much the same way, as is clear from a juxtaposition of a similar comparison[26] in Theognis (329-330). These two incongruities might have contributed to some comic effect (παρὰ προσδοκίαν), whereas the meaning remains clear.

Although its direct context does not survive, one might, connecting the fable with the mythical episode of Heracles in the service (and clothes) of Omphale[27], conjecture that by the fable Achaeus somehow illustrated the *Verkehrte Welt* motif: one does not expect a hero to obey to, let alone to dress like, a woman, like one does not expect an eagle to be beaten by a tortoise (nor by a turtle). One might, in this connection, point to the symbolic value of the two fable characters involved: the eagle obviously represents Zeus (Heracles' father), whereas the tortoise is connected with Aphrodite Urania and symbolizes marital fidelity[28]. These mythological associations support the above hypothesis: a fable about an eagle beaten by a tortoise seems an apt metaphorical representation of a seemingly invincible hero's faithful servitude to a woman in love.

Although both Achaeus' *Omphale* (*TragGrF*I, 20F32-35) and the fable alluded to there have been lost, the allusion itself must soon have become famous, witness the frequent use which Menedemus of Eretria (15T1 = 53A1) made of it more than one century later, according to Diogenes Laërtius (15T2 = 53T1) and Erasmus (15T3 = 53T2).

[24] Keller 1913, 247.

[25] See Dähnhardt (1912, 89-90, 63), quoting Bastian's translation (A., *Orient und Occident* 3, 497), and comparing (ib. 63-64) races between king-crow and snail, crane and lobster, swallow and frog.

[26] Not an allusion to some variant of the fable under consideration; see the Appendix below.

[27] Ov. *F.* 2.305-358, *Her.* 9.53sqq.; Luc. *DDeor.* 15; Plu. *Mor.* 785EF; Prop. 3.11.17-20, 4.9.45sqq.; Graves 1960, II 162-168; Geisau, H. von, "Omphale", *DKP* 4, col. 298-299.

[28] See the literature quoted below, Cerc. 22A1, nn. 169-170.

Conclusion

The small number of extant fables on the one hand and the loss of their contexts on the other prevent any definite statements to be made about the function of fables in Greek satyr play.

Both Sophocles' fable and Achaeus' allusion do seem to have been connected with the satyr play's central action. The former may have served as some sort of libretto to the play, whereas the latter, comprising two (possibly comic) incongruities, perhaps metaphorically represented both the protagonist and his partner.

CHAPTER FIVE

COMEDY

Ἀμαθὴς γὰρ ἔφυς κοὐ πολυπράγμων, οὐδ' Αἴσωπον πεπάτηκας...
(Ar. 17F6.471-472; G2)

16. *Dinolochus*

16F1 Dinol. fr. 8 Kaibel *ap.* Ael. *NA* 6.51: Ass and Snake (*Aes.* 458)

Aelian (16T1) includes Dinolochus, "Epicharmus' antagonist", among those in whose poetical works the aetiological fable about the Ass and the *Dipsas* (Ibyc. 8F1)[1] occurred. As Aelian's statement cannot be combined with other testimonies, nor with any of the comic writer's fragments, however, the quondam context and exact function of the fable cannot be ascertained.

17. *Aristophanes*[2]

17F1 Ar. *V.* 1182: Mouse and Weasel (not in *Aes.*[3])

Philocleon quotes the following *incipit* of a fable[4] in iambic trimeters:
"Once upon a time there was a mouse[5] and a ferret[6]"[7]

---

[1] Bowra (1961, 244) suggests that, since both Ibycus and Dinolochus are from Sicily, the fable is "a local variant on the common theme of plants which enable men to live for ever."

[2] Much to my regret, attempts to order Ewbank 1980 have so far remained unsuccessful.

[3] Perry (1962, 328) did consider the passage under discussion to be an allusion to a fable; see Van Dijk 1994a, 102-103, 112 n. 35.

[4] Fairy-tale according to Crusius 1894b, 534-535; Bolte-Pollívka 1912-1932, IV 41-42; Aly 1928, col. 258; Herzog-Hauser, G., "Nutrix", *RE* 17.2, Stuttgart 1937, col. 1494.

[5] Not mice (contra Archibald 1912, 64; Perry 1962, 38; Adrados 1979a, 164), nor a rat (contra Denis 1883, 240; Nøjgaard 1964, 554).

[6] Not weasels (contra Perry 1962, 38), nor a cat (contra Denis 1883, 240; Starkie 1897, 338; Espino 1942, 12; Nøjgaard 1964, 226; MacDowell 1971, 283, cf. 181-182), let alone frogs (contra Adrados 1979a, 164, presumably confusing "ranas" with "ratones").

[7] Translations from *Wasps* by Sommerstein 1983, *passim*.

Both introductory temporal adjuncts (οὕτω ποτ') are typical of fables[8], as well as the joint occurrence of the antagonists, avowed enemies (*Kontrastfiguren*) in both fable[9] and daily life[10]. What particular weasel-mouse fable Philocleon was about to tell remains unclear[11], since he is interrupted by his son.

The function of the fable in its context is comic. The fable is told by Philocleon to his son, to show him that he is capable of telling stories indeed. However, Bdelycleon did not mean this particular kind of stories. Bdelycleon had initially asked his father whether he could tell noble stories (1174 λόγους) in the presence of learned and witty men. Philocleon had peremptorily confirmed but started to list, by way of example, naughty and obscene themes from mythology. Bdelycleon interrupted by specifying that he did not mean myths (1179 μύθους), i.e. stories about gods, but popular stories (1180 οἵους λέγομεν μάλιστα) about human affairs (1179 τῶν ἀνθρωπίνων), homely ones (1180 τοὺς κατ' οἰκίαν). Philocleon again endorses and enthusiastically takes up the last quality requested, but appears to misinterpret "homely stories" to mean "home stories, stories about domestic animals", by delivering the above fable *incipit*. However, he is again cut off, this time more rudely (1183-1184), by his son, who remarks that beast fables are not suited as subject matter among men (1185; G1b).

The comic function of the fable is characteristic of its context. Philocleon's quoting the beginning of a fable is but one in a series of hilarious misunderstandings and *double entendres*[12]. Bdelycleon is trying hard to re-educate his father now that he has been cured of his "juryitis", but Philocleon proves to be unteachable. When Bdelycleon has finally taught his father how to behave—how to dress, tell stories, recline, and sing *scolia* (1122-1249)—, they go off to the symposium, after he has reassured him that it does not matter if he gets drunk and lawless, provided that he has learned at the symposium some

[8] Σ *ad loc.* (17T23a; G67a); Starkie 1897, 338; MacDowell 1971, 283; cf. the Synthesis above.

[9] Phaedr. G15b; Babr. 32, *fab. aes.* 50 Hausrath (*Aes.* 50); Phaedr. 4.6, Babr. 31 (*vss.* 9-10 *et ap. Sudam*, φ 711 Adler), *fab. aes.* 174 Hausrath (*Aes.* 165); *fab. aes.* 212 Hausrath (*Aes.* 197); Phaedr. 1.22, Babr. 27 (*Aes.* 293); Schibli 1983, 2, n. 3, 8, 10, n. 30. For Doderer's term, see above, Chapter I.I, 2.3 and 2.5.

[10] Cf. the weasel's Latin name *mustela* (μυοθήρας; Keller 1909, I, 165).

[11] Cf. Denis 1883, 240; Perry 1962, 38. Adrados (1979a, 173 n. 14, 377, 413) conjectures that Philocleon alludes to the *galeamyomachia* in *Aes.* 165.

[12] 1194-1195, 1200-1201, 1205-1207, 1210, 1227.

witty Aesopic or[13] Sybaritic fable, which will raise laughter and mitigate the injured party (G1c). Understandably, Philocleon is eager to learn many of these (1262-1264).

The next three fables (17F2-4) are attempts to put Bdelycleon's advice into practice.

17F2 Ar. *V.* 1399-1405: Aesop and Bitch (*Aes.* 423)

Philocleon tells the following fable[14]:

"When Aesop was walking home from dinner one evening, he was barked at by an insolent, drunken bitch.[15] And then he said, 'Bitch, bitch, I tell you, if in exchange for[16] that evil tongue of yours[17] you went and got some wheat somewhere, I think you'd be sensible.'"

The fable is explicitly announced as such (1399 λόγον; cf. 1394 λόγοι)[18]. The first three lines of the fable contain as many formal characteristics of the genre: its protagonist[19], Aesop (the very first word of the fable), (2) the indefinite[20] τις, (3) the temporal adjunct κἄπειτ' (1403)[21].

The fable is told by Philocleon to some Myrtia, a proud[22] woman bread seller, who is angry with him for having spoilt her bread. Philocleon, mindful of his son's advice, self-confidently tries to reconcile his misconduct with a fable, although Myrtia is unwilling to listen (1400). Ironically, he announces a tactful (1394 δεξιοί[23]; G1d) and gracious (1400 χαρίεντα) fable. His Aesopic specimen, however, is everything but that: it is a subtle but undeniable misrepresentation of

---

13 Cope (1867, 255, n. 1) tars these with the same brush.

14 Contra: Neubner 1889, 31.

15 Quoted by [Hdn.] 17T13.

16 Schwarzbaum (1979, p. XLIII, n. 39) appears to misinterpret ἀντὶ when he translates: "You would do well to sell your wicked tongue and buy some wheat".

17 τῆς κακῆς γλώττης, which has nothing to do (as Dahlén (C., *Zu Johannes Tzetzes' Exegesis der Hesiodeischen Erga*, Diss. Uppsala: Almqvist & Wiksell 1933, 66-67) apparently believes) with the episode in *Vit. Aesop.* 51-55GW about the tongue as both the best and the worst there is, for which see Adrados, F.R., *Alabanza y vituperio de la lengua*, Madrid: Real Academia Española 1991, 19-20.

18 Cf. Adrados 1979a, 27.

19 Adrados (1979a, 160) remarks that the passage can also be analysed as an anecdote in which Aesop "lanza una frase graciosa, un Αἰσώπου γελοῖον".

20 Cf. 1404 ποθὲν, as well as the Synthesis above.

21 Cf. S. 13F2.1152 κᾆτ'.

22 1396-1397; Van Leeuwen 1909, 212; MacDowell 1971, 312: "She recounts her name and parentage to sound impressive".

23 Interpreted by Miller (1945, 402) to be a comic reference to 1258 ἀστεῖον (G1c).

the facts and offensive at the same time. On the one hand, Philocleon's fable obviously represents himself and the bread seller by Aesop and the bitch, respectively: Aesop, like Philocleon, is returning from a banquet[24]; Aesop's *réplique finale* clearly applies to the bread seller, not to the bitch.[25] It is typical of fables that the *réplique finale* bears on the context. On the other hand, fable and context are incongruous: in (dramatic) reality it is Philocleon who is drunk, in the fable the bitch[26]. At the same time, the fable is bluntly insulting for the addressee, even though ancient bread sellers seem to have had the same reputation as modern fishwives[27]. Aesop's antagonist is thrice called a "bitch" (ambiguous in Greek as in English)[28], being "reckless", "drunk", "barking"[29], using "malicious language", far from being "*compos mentis*". Moreover, Philocleon's repetition[30] of the bread seller's "by Jove[31]" (1400, 1404) in the fable is teasing. For all these reasons, the fable, understandably, only adds to the bread seller's rage. Hence her reaction: she (rightly) takes the fable as mockery and announces that she will prosecute him, backed by one Chairephon. Both leave the stage[32] after Philocleon has expressed his contempt for them by a futile anecdote[33] and a mock paratragic comparison[34].

17F3 Ar. *V.* 1427-1432: Sybarite and Friend (*Aes.* 428)

The Aesopic fable (17F2) is followed by two Sybaritic ones (17F3-4). The first of these, which is paraphrased by Pseudo-Diogenianus (17T8; G28) to exemplify this local variant of the genre, runs thus:

---

[24] 1401 ἀπὸ δείπνου ~ 1250 ἐπὶ δεῖπνον; 1401 βαδίζονθ' ~ 1322 οἴκαδ' ἔρχεται.

[25] Contra Lilja 1976, 75-76; Adrados 1985, 287. Cf. MacDowell 1971, 312.

[26] 1402 μεθύσῃ ~ 1252 μεθυσθῶμεν, 1300 πολὺ παροινικώτατος, 1322 'μέθυεν, 1393 οἶνον; cf. MacDowell lc.

[27] Starkie 1897, 369; MacDowell 1971, 311.

[28] 1402 κύων, 1403 κύον κύον. LSJ sv (II): "in a coarse sense"; Lilja (1976, 69 n. 1, 76): "harlot"; Lonsdale, S.H., "Attitudes towards Animals in Ancient Greece", *G&R n.s.* 26, 1979, 151: "prostitute".

[29] For the metaphorical meaning of ὑλακτέω, see LSJ sv; e.g. S. *El.* 299 with Groeneboom, P., *Sophocles' Electra*, Groningen 1935, *ad loc.*

[30] On the principle of "Comic Iteration in Aristophanes", see Miller 1945.

[31] Perry (1965, 503) prefers to translate "by God". Dillon (M., "By Gods, Tongues, and Dogs: the Use of Oaths in Aristophanic Comedy", *G&R n.s.* 42, 1995, 137), observing that most oaths "are little more than expletives", admits that "the repetition...of a common formula may be amusing in itself".

[32] Van Leeuwen (1909, 216) keeps them on stage until 1441.

[33] 1410-1411. See the Appendix below.

[34] 1414-1415. See Taillardat 1965, 213-216.

"A man of Sybaris fell out of a chariot, and somehow or other he broke his head very badly; the fact was, he wasn't an expert driver. Then a friend of his stood over him and said to him: 'let every man pursue the trade he knows.' And it's the same here: you run along to Pittalus'[35] place!"

Typical fable features in this specimen are (1) the indefinite πως (1428; cf. ποθὲν in 17F2), (2) the temporal adjunct κᾄπειτ' (1430; as in 17F2), (3) the appearance of an unspecified *survenant*[36], and (4) the introductory formula of the epimythium οὕτω δὲ καὶ σύ (1432)[37].

The fable[38] is told by Philocleon to an accuser[39], who has only just entered, accompanied by a summons-witness, and threatens to prosecute Philocleon for assault (1417-1418). The prospect of a lawsuit makes Bdelycleon desperate (1418-1420). Philocleon strikes a conciliatory tone by confessing that he has indeed beaten him black and blue, and proposing to pay an indemnity and become his friend (1421-1425). When the accuser, misled, urges him to go ahead because he is not quarrelsome (1426), Philocleon narrates the above fable, deliberately misinterpreting the accuser's command: by σὺ λέγε (1426) the latter meant "I leave it to you to say how much you want to pay as an indemnity", whereas Philocleon appears to understand "tell me a story".

The relation between the fable and its context is obvious: the Sybarite and the *survenant* correspond to the addressee (the accuser) and the narrator (Philocleon), respectively. Both the horseman and the accuser have sustained physical injury.[40] The *réplique finale* constitutes not only the passer-by's[41] advice to the fallen horseman but also Philocleon's advice to the accuser: "Let the cobbler stick to his last". This proverb[42] (quoted by Pseudo-Diogenianus (17T8) and the *Suda*

---

[35] A famous doctor; Ar. *Ach.* 1032, 1222; Starkie 1897, 373; MacDowell 1971, 317.

[36] Fraenkel 1920, 369; see the Synthesis above.

[37] Cf. above, Stesich. 7F2, n. 151; S. 13F1, n. 63; Chapter I.I, Adrados, Holzberg (1.7, 1.9).

[38] Contra: Neubner 1889, 31; Nøjgaard 1964, 232, 459.

[39] Not to Bdelycleon, as Adrados (1987a, 292) states.

[40] 1428 κατεάγη τῆς κεφαλῆς μέγα σφόδρα ~ 1422 πατάξαι καὶ βαλεῖν.

[41] Not the Sybarite's (contra Hausrath 1909, col. 1720).

[42] Σ *ad* 1431a: παροιμιακόν V, παροιμία *Lh.* 1431 c: καὶ ταῦτα ἐν ταῖς παροιμίαις φέρεται RLhAld / φέρουσιν V. Cf. Hor. *Ep.* 1.14.44; Prop. 2.1.46; Otto 1890, 37; Starkie 1897, 373; Van Leeuwen 1909, 215; MacDowell 1971, 317. McKay (1970, 44, n. 16) compares Call. *Epigr.* 1 Pfeiffer.12, 16 τὴν κατὰ σαυτὸν ἔλα [see the Appendix below] and Crin. *AP* 9.516.1 Ἔρδοι τὴν ἔμαθέν τις; Prittwitz-Gaffron, E.

(17T31ab); alluded to and translated into Latin by Cicero (17T2-3); explained by Erasmus (17T61)) clearly refers to the Sybarite horseman's lack of experience but also maliciously points to the accuser's peacefulness: "don't meddle in processes". In the epimythium[43] Philocleon overtly urges the accuser to look for medical, not legal, aid.

At the same time, both fable characters *differ* from their dramatic counterparts: first, the Sybarite is to blame himself for his injury, whereas the accuser might reasonably point to Philocleon; secondly, the *survenant is* the Sybarite's friend, whereas Philocleon is *not yet* the accuser's friend.[44] These two incongruities have a comic function and will have increased the accuser's fury. Therefore, neither Bdelycleon's nor the accuser's reaction causes surprise: the former is astonished at Philocleon's unteachability (1433), whereas the latter begs his summons-witness[45] to take notice of Philocleon's answer (1434)—to use it against him in court, of course—and begins to walk away.

17F4 Ar. *V.* 1435-1440: Sybarite, Vase and Witness (*Aes.* 438)

But Philocleon asks them not to leave (1435) and adds another Sybaritic fable[46]:

"Once upon a time in Sybaris a woman broke a jar."

At this moment, the accuser calls on his summons-witness to take notice of this. Philocleon reacts *ad rem* by incorporating the accuser's interruption in the fable:

"So the jar, which was with someone, called him to witness. Then the Sybarite woman said: 'By the Maiden[47], if you'd forgotten this calling people to witness and hurried up and bought a bandage, you'd have been more sensible.'"

This specimen (quoted by anon. *Περὶ αἴνου* (17T10; G39) and the

---

von, *Das Sprichwort im griechischen Epigramm*, Diss. München 1911, 34-35; Leutsch-Schneidewin *ad* Macar. 8.39.

[43] This is not the *fabula docet* (contra Fraenkel 1920, 367). Nor does it prove that Ps.-Diogenian. 17T8 means by αἶνος only the "Lehrsatz", not the "zugrunde liegende[n] Erzählung" (Heimgartner 1940, 31).

[44] 1430 ἀνὴρ αὐτῷ φίλος ~ 1425 εἶναι φίλον τὸ λοιπόν. Differently Sommerstein's paraphrase of the epimythium: "'the Sybarite got no sympathy from his friend, and you'll get none from me.'"

[45] Thus Van Leeuwen 1909, 216; Coulon-Van Daele II 80; contra: MacDowell (1971, 317), who argues that Bdelycleon is the accuser's addressee.

[46] Contra: Neubner 1889, 31.

[47] Persephone; see Σ 1438a; MacDowell 1971, 317.

Suda (17T30)) again contains three typical fable features, viz. the time adjuncts ποτε (1435; as in 17F1) and εἶθ' (1438; cf. κἄπειτ' in 17F2-3 and κᾆτ' in S. 13F2), and the indefinite τιν' (1437; as in 17F2).

It is again obvious that the Sybarite (this time female) and the vase correspond to the narrator (Philocleon) and the addressee (the accuser), respectively. Both in the fable and on stage the former has broken the latter. Philocleon has the fable resemble the actual situation very closely: as soon as the injured party calls a witness in the drama, this also happens in the fable. This aping has a comic function and will only have added to the accuser's rage. The *réplique finale*[48] again bears on both the fable and its context: the Sybarite and Philocleon recommend, respectively, the vase and the accuser to bind up their wounds[49] instead of calling a witness. Philocleon has the context subtly intrude into the fable: the inanimate object has a juridical connotation, which is to the point now that a lawsuit is in store for Philocleon. An ἐχῖνος was a vase[50] in which the notes of evidence were kept sealed up during lawsuits[51]. Hence the accuser's interruption, which has somewhat puzzled modern commentators[52], becomes intelligible: breaking such a vase is of course a flagrant infringement on the rules of justice, against which the accuser indignantly protests.

The accuser (rightly) takes Philocleon's Sybaritic fable as an insult and threatens with a lawsuit; *exit* accuser with summons-witness (1441).

17F5 Ar. *V.* 1448: Dung Beetle, Hare and Eagle (*Aes.* 3)

Bdelycleon now takes up his father and carries him inside, to prevent

[48] Nøjgaard (1964, 460) observes, for the record, that this is "la première réplique finale conditionelle".

[49] Contra Sommerstein 1983, 243: "advice meant for Philocleon's accuser rather than for the jar".

[50] Σ 1436a: χύτρας εἶδος; 1436b: ἄγγος τι χαλκοῦν, ἢ καὶ ἐκ κεράμου. Here ἐχῖνος does not refer to a Hedgehog (contra Coulon-Van Daele (ed.) II 80; Cascajero 1991, 29), let alone to a Tortoise (contra Nøjgaard 1964, 459). Chambry translates (1960, p. XXVIII): "'boîte à procès'".

[51] Arist. *Ath.* 53.3; D. 39.17, 45.57-58, 48.48; Thphr. *Char.* 6 *c.* Σ *ad loc.*; Starkie 1897, 374; Van Leeuwen 1909, 216; LSJ sv (II 2).

[52] Unsatisfactory solutions have been looked for by Van Leeuwen (1909, 216): "satis intellegens civis vulneratus nunc quoque se derideri *testem te advoco* ait"; MacDowell (1971, 317): "as he says 'broke a jar' he knocks the Accuser down, as if to break him by way of illustration"; Perry (1965, 509) and Jedrkiewicz (1989, 362), who appear to assign the interruption to Philocleon and the vase, respectively.

him from causing any more lawsuits (1442-1445). While he is being carried inside, Philocleon starts to tell a story:

"Aesop was once accused—"

Bdelycleon, however, immediately cuts off his father's narration:

"I'm not interested."

Bdelycleon's words, expressing disdain, comically repeat words which Philocleon had used against the bread seller before.[53] Thus Philocleon gets a taste of his own medicine, for he had twice mockingly echoed his son's words earlier in the play.[54] Philocleon, in his turn, does not appear to care a bit about his son's lack of interest in his fables (as before with the bread seller (1400)) and goes on, imperturbably finishing his sentence:

"by the Delphians of stealing a libation-bowl belonging to the god; and he told them how once upon a time the beetle—"

But, unlike the bread seller, Bdelycleon does not allow Philocleon to continue and takes him off stage[55]:

"You'll be the death of me[56], dammit, you and your beetles!"

The fable proper is extremely short: after only three words, one of which is even an article[57], Philocleon's[58] narration of the fable is rudely cut off. In spite of its utmost brevity, Aristophanes has very cleverly made clear (1) that it was a *fable* Philocleon was about to narrate, and (2) *which* particular fable he had in mind. This clarity has been provided for by the presentation[59] of the fable. As for the genre of Philocleon's short story, the fable is recognizable as such because it is put into the mouth of Aesop, the fabulist *par excellence*, and, in addition, by the indefinite introductory time adjunct (1449 ποτ'; cf. 1446[60]; 17F1, 17F4). It is noteworthy that Philocleon is twice interrupted immediately after having said "ποτ(ε)": Bdelycleon is fed up

---

[53] 1446 ~ 1411; MacDowell (1971, 259, 318) aptly coins this a "boomerang joke".

[54] 959 ~ 989, 1190-1192 ~ 1383-1384.

[55] Banks (1980, 83) connects this scene with the opening scenes, when Philocleon was also "forcibly kept indoors by his son."

[56] ἀπολεῖς; Reiske's ἀπολῶ σ' is adopted by Starkie (1897, 86) and Van Leeuwen (1909, 217), but see MacDowell 1971, 318-319.

[57] Nøjgaard (1964, 288, 511) observes that this is the oldest extant use of the article in combination with a fable character in Greek literature. However, the article may have an *allusive* function; cf. below, D. 40F1.

[58] Not Bdelycleon's (contra Adrados 1979a, 159).

[59] Adrados (1979a, 160; 1982c, 176; 1984b, 138) calls this a "presentación de segundo grado", but one might perhaps better distinguish three levels, as the author is the primary speaker.

[60] Adrados (1979a, 398) seems to confuse the anecdote and the fable.

with his father's stories and twice cuts him off at this typically storytelling introduction.

The content of Philocleon's aborted fable can be ascertained by comparing other sources. There is a widespread ancient tradition[61] that the Delphians wanted to get rid of Aesop; therefore, they smuggled a sacred bowl into his luggage and subsequently put him to death on an accusation of sacrilege. The extant Greek recensions of the *Life of Aesop* elaborately describe how Aesop in vain tried to ward off capital punishment by telling the Delphians fables. The only fable featuring a dung beetle is that in which the vile creature took revenge on an eagle for violating his refugee, a hare; even Zeus was not able, nor willing, to protect the eagle from the dung beetle's revenge otherwise than by separating the two species' (breeding) seasons.[62] In all probability, Philocleon has Aesop broach some version of this particular fable, too. In the *Vita* the fable is told by Aesop to the Delphians when they are dragging him out of the Muses' (Apollo's in W and Pl)[63] sanctuary, where Aesop had taken refuge. Aesop metaphorically represents himself, his audience, and his future revengers by the hare, the eagle, and the dung beetle in the fable, respectively. The function of Aesop's fable is to dissuade the Delphians from dragging him out of his refuge—the final aetiology is of secondary importance here.

In the passage under consideration Philocleon compares his situation to Aesop's, who, in turn, had compared his to the hare's. This implies that Philocleon, the narrator, compares the addressee of the fable, Bdelycleon, to the Delphians, whom Aesop compared to the eagle. The dung beetle stands for a third, unspecified, revenger. There is an important religious dimension: in the *Vita* both the dung beetle and Aesop, and thus, implicitly, Philocleon in *Wasps*, appeal to

---

[61] Σ *ad loc.*; Heracl., *FHG* 2.219; Plu. *Mor.* 556F (cf. Luzzatto 1988); Him. G55; Σ *in* Luc. *Phal.* 1.6; *Suda*, Αι 334 Adler. Aesop's death in Delphi is reported also by Hdt. 2.134 (ignored by Sommerstein 1983, 243); Ael. fr. 203 Hercher; Eus. *Chron.* (II 94 Schoene); Hier. *Chron.* 1450; *IG* 14.1297; Ptol. Chenn. (Heph.) *ap.* Phot. *Bibl.* 190, 152b11-12; Call. 20F1.15-17 *ap.* Apollon. (20T3); *POxy.* 1800; Σ *in* Call. *Iamb.* 1, fr. 191.27 Pfeiffer; Zen. 1.47; Lib. *Or.* 24.31, *Decl.* 1.181; *Suda*, αι 332, ε 1909 Adler (*Aes.* T3, 9-13, 20-32, 47); Georg. Sync. 454 (p. 286 Mosshammer); Vinc. Bell. *Prol.* (II 234 Hervieux).

[62] References given above, Semon. 5F2, n. 101. The other extant dung beetle fables (*fab. aes.* 86, 109, 114 Hausrath (*Aes.* 84, 107, 112)) are unlikely to have been applied by both Philocleon and Aesop to their respective situations.

[63] See Jedrkiewicz 1989, 87; Papathomopoulos 1989, 138; Van Dijk 1995b, 146.

Zeus (W, Pl: Apollo)[64], who could not even protect the mighty eagle (Zeus' bird) from the vile dung beetle's revenge.

Philocleon's situation resembles Aesop's in that both are being dragged away violently. In addition, both have been indicted and both are in hot water, but here two incongruities are apparent. First, Aesop was falsely accused, whereas the charges brought against Philocleon—theft of a flute player (1435)[65], demolishing of merchandise (1406-1407), assault (1417-1418)—are justified. Secondly, Aesop faces his execution, Philocleon his *exit*. By these incongruities Philocleon hyperbolically represents himself as an innocent martyr and his son as a brute sycophant, which has a comic function, if only because of Philocleon's drunkenness. A final, and ironic, correspondence between Philocleon's and Aesop's dung beetle fable is its ineffectiveness: both narrators are dragged away, in spite of their threats. Even here, though, an incongruous detail might be noted: whereas the Delphians had at least the patience to listen to Aesop's fable, Philocleon's is nipped in the bud.

17F6 Ar. *Av.*[66] 472-475: Lark and Her Father (*Aes.* 447)

In *Birds* the following fable occurs:

"He [Aesop] said in his tale that the Lark was born first of all birds, before the Earth came to be. Then her father fell sick and died; there was no earth, he'd been lying unburied for four days[67], she had no idea what to do, and finally in desperation she buried her father in her own head."[68]

The fable[69] is recognizable as such by its ascription to Aesop's telling (G2)[70]. A typical fable feature is the temporal adjunct κἄπειτ'

[64] G: dung beetle—κατορκώσας...κατὰ τοῦ Διός. Aesop—αἰδέσθητε Δία Ξένιον καὶ Ὀλύμπιον.

[65] Vaio (1971, 343) and Jedrkiewicz (1989, 362) mention only this accusation.

[66] Wache (1919/1920, 417) regards the play as a whole as a "Tierfabel in dramatischer Form".

[67] 474 πεμπταῖον; see Van Leeuwen 1902 and Sommerstein 1987 *ad loc.*; Hofmann (1976, 167, n.1) takes this as "ein ironischer Pan-Solonismus".

[68] Translation by Sommerstein 1987, 71. Erasmus (17T63b) gives a paraphrase.

[69] Contra: Neubner (1889, 30) and Nøjgaard (1964, 468; cf. above, Chapter I.I, 1.3), who do not consider aetiologies to be fables.

[70] 472 ὃς ἔφασκε λέγων "who used to tell" (West 1984, 121); the pleonastic use of two *verba dicendi* is quite common (Van Leeuwen 1902, 79) and need not be explained by assuming that Peisthetaerus is quoting from a larger context (contra Jedrkiewicz 1989, 388, n. 114; cf. Fraenkel 1962, 91-92; Casevitz 1978, 48); cf. Dunbar 1995, 326: "said in the course of his story".

(473; as in 17F2-3; cf. εἶθ' in 17F4). Originally it is an aetiological fable, explaining the origin of the lark's crest[71]. Aelian (17T12; quoted by Apostol. 17T54 (Arsen. 17T58a)) derives Aristophanes' fable from an Indian myth[72] about a pious prince who buried his parents in his head and was subsequently metamorphosed by the Sun into a crested hoopoe[73]. Whatever the exact relation between the Greek and Indian versions may be[74], there are two structural and two minor differences. First, the Greek version does not include a metamorphosis, whereas the Indian does; furthermore, the Greek father dies from illness (473 νόσῳ), the Indian parents from weariness of a hasty flight from wicked sons. Besides, the two versions involve a different species of bird and a different number of parents[75] buried in its head.

The fable, written in catalectic anapaestic tetrameters, occurs in the *epirrhema* of the *agon* It is told by Pisthetaerus[76] to the assembly of birds. The function of the fable is to prove to the birds that they are primeval[77] and even antedate Earth (469-470). The fable is used somewhat improperly[78], in that an aetiology is used as a persuasive instrument: the aetiology of the lark's crest literally shows, and overstates[79], that the earth dates from *after* the lark, *casu quo* the birds, whose first representative was the lark[80]. The persuasion implies de-

[71] Zielinski (1889, 157) traces the fable back to the homonymy of "λόφος 'Haube' und λόφος 'Hugel, Grabhugel'" However, λόφος means "*crest of a hill, ridge*" (LSJ sv (II)), not mound Cf 279, 292-293, Newiger 1957, 85-86, Dover 1972, 145

[72] "legend" Sommerstein 1987, 227, Dunbar 1995, 326 "fable"

[73] Van Leeuwen (1902, 269, cf Zundel 1847, 438)—not Aelian (contra Van Rooijen-Dijkman 1984, 11)—suspects that the phoenix (Hdt 2 73) is meant Contra (rightly) Hausrath 1909, col 1727

[74] Cf Hofmann 1976, 165 with n 2; Adrados 1987a, 348, although elsewhere (1990, 223) he derives the Indian from the Greek version, and compares a rabbinic fable

[75] This difference is overlooked by Adrados 1987a, 348

[76] The paradosis "Peisthetairos" is defended by Pozzi (1985-1986, 119, n 1) and Craik (1987, 27, n 7), and Latinized by (e g) Coulon-Van Daele III 22 Some prefer "Peisetairos" (e g Dunbar 1995, 128-129), "Pisetaerus" (e g Alink 1983, *passim*), "Peisetaerus" (Sommerstein 1987, *passim*), "Peithetairos" (e g Murray 1933, 79), "Peithetairus" (Oldaker 1933/1934, 85), "Pisthetairos" (e g Seel, O , *Aristophanes oder Versuch uber Komodie*, Stuttgart· Klett 1960, 141), or "Pisterero" (Adrados 1979a, 159)

[77] The fable is not meant as a cosmogonic or genealogic parody (contra Casevitz 1978, 48, Zanetto 1987, 223)

[78] Hofmann (1976, 165-168) deduces that Aristophanes reinterprets a pre-existing fable

[79] 473 προτέραν τῆς γῆς, 474 γῆν δ' οὐκ εἶναι.

[80] 472 κορυδὸν πάντων πρώτην ὄρνιθα.

ductive logic: *had* earth already existed—which was not the case[81] —, the lark would of course have buried her father in the ground, not in her head. An obvious verbal parallel, occurring both immediately before and immediately after the fable[82], indicates that the main issue in the fable and its context is identical: the lark existed before the earth.

Immediately after the fable, before its narrator, Pisthetaerus, can draw the conclusion in an epimythium, Euelpides, the *bomolochos*, naturally does not hesitate to make the most of the fable's comic opportunities and draws a conclusion of his own: "so now father lark is buried in Kephalè" (476). The use of ἄρα and νυνί clearly characterizes Euelpides' interjection as an aetiological conclusion: he pretends to interpret Pisthetaerus' Aesopic fable as an aetiology of the name of an Attic deme, on whose territory there was in fact[83] a large graveyard at the time. Yet this aetiology, obvious though it must have been to the contemporary audience, is not to be taken seriously, because Euelpides shifts the emphasis which Pisthetaerus had clearly laid in his narration of the fable; whereas the latter undeniably focuses upon the earth being younger than the lark, the former establishes a linkage with the penultimate word of the fable, the lark's "head". Part of the fun consists in the fact that, at first sight, this mock aetiology seems to be in perfect accordance with the fable, because Euelpides almost exclusively uses words from Pisthetaerus' fable.[84] The comic effect of this joke is based also upon a transference of an element from the fictitious animal fable, viz. the "head", to human reality. Finally, Aristophanes creates a comic effect by separating the fable proper and its epimythium by Euelpides' interruption, which, in itself, takes the edge off of Pisthetaerus' argument: his fable is reduced to an explanation of local toponomy. In addition, the line may convey an ingenious reference to Philocles, a tragedian

---

[81] 474 ἀποροῦσαν, 475 ὑπ' ἀμηχανίας.

[82] 473 προτέραν τῆς γῆς ~ 469-470 ἀρχαιότεροι πρότεροί τε... | καὶ Γῆς. [XO.] Καὶ Γῆς; 477 πρότεροι...γῆς. Besides, it may be noted that the metrical position of the second Γῆς in 470 is the same as that of γῆς in 473.

[83] See Buchholz, G., "Ein Friedhof im Gebiet des attischen Demos Kephale", *Archaologischer Anzeiger* 1963, 455-498; Fraenkel, E., "Aristophanes Vogel 476", *MH* 21, 1964, 72; Hofmann 1976, 168, n. 3.

[84] 476 'Ο πατὴρ ~ 473 τὸν πατέρ', 476 τῆς κορυδοῦ ~ 472 κορυδὸν, 476 κεῖται ~ 474 προκεῖσθαι, 476 τεθνεώς ~ 473 ἀποθνήσκειν, 476 Κεφαλῆσιν ~ 475 ἐν τῇ κεφαλῇ.

associated in the same play with two species of crested birds—first with a hoopoe (281), then with a very lark (1295)—and possibly belonging to this very deme.[85]

Only after this comic one-liner is Pisthetaerus, the stooge, allowed to draw the conclusion of his fable in an epimythium: The birds' primordiality permits, and obliges, them to regain the dominion of the world (477-478).[86] The fable is closely connected with the subsequent section, in which Pisthetaerus adds three other ornithological aetiologies—about the cock, the kite, and the cuckoo—to prove (482 τεκμήρια) that birds once ruled the world. The first of these is, like the fable of the crested lark, followed by a remark of Euelpides on the crest "on the head"[87] of the bird in question (*in casu* the cock). The birds' one-time royal[88] dignity contrasts sharply with their actual position as game. The accumulated evidence appears to be a damning proof[89] to the chorus of birds, who now are determined to become masters of the universe (548-549).

The lesson of Pisthetaerus' aetiological fable, viz. the birds' primordiality, is incorporated in the birds' own cosmogony in the chorus' first parabasis later in the play (676-800). The phrase "there was no earth"[90] seems to be an echo of the fable about the lark who perforce buried her father in her own head.

17A1 Ar. *Ach.* 120: Ape and Fox (*Aes.* 81)

A scholium (17T14) observes that the following Aristophanic iambic trimeter parodies a fragment from an epod by Archilochus[91]:

"oh you, you monkey, although having such a beard"

---

[85] Dunbar 1995, 327, referring to Schroeder, O, *Die Vogel*, Berlin 1927 and Davies, J K, *Athenian Propertied Families*, Oxford 1971, no 14546 To Dunbar (ib 641) these ornithological references to Philocles "strongly suggest[s] that the crown of his head had an unusual, crest-like shape"

[86] Cf Heberlein 1980, 51, Konstan, D., "A City in the Air: Aristophanes' *Birds*", *Arethusa* 23, 1990, 196-197

[87] 487 (cf 515) ἐπὶ τῆς κεφαλῆς ~ 475 ἐν τῇ κεφαλῇ, 476 Κεφαλῆσιν

[88] In the wake of Craik (1987, 28), one might argue that the double occurrence of βασιλῆς in 467 (cf 478, 482, 486, 499, 500, 504, 508, 514, 515, 549) is both a religious and an ornithological joke, pointing to the sacred marriage of the Anthesteria and punning on βασιλεύς "wren" (cf 1708 τύραννον), respectively

[89] Cf Murphy, C T, "Aristophanes and the Art of Rhetoric", *HSCPh* 49, 1938, 96, 107

[90] 694 γῆ δ' οὐδ' ἀὴρ οὐδ' οὐρανὸς ἦν (cf 701-702) ~ 474 γῆν δ' οὐκ εἶναι, cf Dunbar 1995, 438

[91] Not Aeschylus', as Jedrkiewicz (1989, 364) suggests

The parody is recognizable as such, because Aristophanes has copied Archilochus' line but substituted[92] πυγήν by πώγων' (and of course adapted the gender of the article and the pronoun correspondingly). The substituted word is still reminiscent of the original because of the identity of the consonants, whereas the vowels and accent differ; by eliding the final -α of πώγωνα, Aristophanes has also made even the number of characters and syllables. Because of this close resemblance of the parody and the parodied, it seems plausible to assume that the former evoked the context of the latter in the minds of the audience. The original Archilochean line has been seen above (4F2) to belong to the lyric poet's version of the fable of the Ape and the Fox; more precisely, it constituted (in all probability) the latter's exultant *réplique finale* when unmasking and deriding the former, whom he had lured into a trap where he exposed his bald bottom, which did not suit the king he tried to play.

In *Acharnians*, the above line is spoken by Dicaeopolis[93] to one of the two alleged eunuchs in the retinue of Pseudartabas, the King's Eye, with whom the Athenian envoys return from their many years' stay at the royal court of Persia, where they appear to have led the life of Riley at public expense (61-90). They deceive the public assembly into thinking that the Persian King will send them much money (102), whereas it is apparent from Pseudartabas' jabber (104) that he certainly will not. Financial aid from Persia was of course a burning issue at the time[94]. Dicaeopolis is the only one to see through this alleged Persian delegation, which through a brief cross-examination he unmasks as dressed-up Greek impostors[95] (113-116). The adagium *nomen est omen* evidently applies to Pseudartabas[96]. In this context

---

[92] Cf. Buchholtz 1873, 177: "Für einen Leibestheil...einen anderen Leibestheil"; Pegoraro, L., "Problemi di metaforica nella definizione dell'ambiguità aristofanesca", *L&S* 18, 1983, 391 (substituting πώγον'). Bentley, curiously enough, restored Archilochus' line in Aristophanes; see Van Leeuwen 1901, 29-30, who rightly objects that "clunes Clisthenis neque cernuntur nunc" and aptly suggests: "si quis eiusmodi quid requirit,...πόσθην vel κριθήν potius legat; quamquam ne id quidem satisfacit."

[93] Not "Dicearco" (contra Jedrkiewicz 1989, 364).

[94] *Acharnians* was produced in 425, in the Peloponnesian War; see e.g. Dover 1972, 78, n. 1.

[95] Cf. Handel 1963, 241, n. 8. Dover (1963, 10; cf. 1972, 78) overcomplicates the matter by contending that Dicaeopolis only "*affects* to think that the Persians...are Athenians in disguise" (my italics).

[96] Cf. Mueller, A., *Aristophanis Acharnenses*, Hannover 1863, 21; Sommerstein 1980, 162; Starkie (1909, 31) Anglicizes "Shamartaba", Douglass Parker (in Chiasson 1984, 131) "Shambyses". Dover (1963, 8), however, argues that, although "the name 'Pseu-

Dicaeopolis alludes to Archilochus' fable: he quotes from its *réplique finale* when unmasking one of the eunuchs. As his quotation contains the vocative ὦ πίθηκε, the eunuch is explicitly equated with the ape; this implies that Dicaeopolis compares himself to the fox: both mockingly unmask a fraud. Still more implicitly, the audience is compared to the animals who did not see through the fraud.

Although the function of the allusion is clear, it is impossible to retrieve *exactly* what is going on on stage[97]. Possibly, Dicaeopolis literally unmasks the eunuch by taking away the latter's bearded mask[98], thus—with typical Aristophanic rupture of the dramatic illusion[99]—revealing the actor's 'real' face[100]; his face must have been (made) hairless (clean-shaven), as can be deduced from Dicaeopolis' comparison[101] of the actor to Clisthenes, whom Aristophanes elsewhere derides as notoriously hairless[102] and effeminate[103]. From 119 it is

---

dartabas' is in itself a joke which expresses a certain view of Persians", he is a real Persian.

[97] Chiasson (1984, 131) calls 119-121 "one of the most puzzling scenes in Aristophanic comedy".

[98] Described by Dearden 1976, 129.

[99] Chapman 1983, 16, n. 61.

[100] Dover (1963, 10) assumes that Dicaeopolis "pulls away the clothing with which the lower half of the man's face, in Persian fashion, is covered, revealing a beardless mask"; cf. Rennie 1909, 108; Edmunds 1980, 4: "Dicaeopolis apparently tears away their disguises". Chiasson (1984, 135, n. 17) rightly opposes Muller-Strubing (H., *Aristophanes und die historische Kritik*, Leipzig 1873, 691-692), who thought that Dicaeopolis pointed to the eunuch's pubic hair.

[101] Some (Van Leeuwen 1901, 29 contra Elmsley; Weber, H., *Aristophanische Studien*, Leipzig: Dieterich/Weicher 1908, 27-29; Whitman 1964, 60; Edmunds 1980, 4-5; Lilja 1980, 31) have been led to think that the eunuch *is* Clisthenes (and his colleague Strato). Contra (rightly; cf. Rennie lc): Chiasson 1984, 131, who, however, argues (ib. 135-136) that Dicaeopolis unveils "a distinctively Oriental style of beard..., the kind of beard worn by Persian royalty in Achaemenid reliefs, especially those at Persepolis". However, this argument (and likewise Buchholtz's (1873, 177-178)) conflicts with the preceding mention of Clisthenes, whom the eunuch will have resembled in hairlessness. Dearden (1976, 129) assumes that the mask looks "like Cleisthenes with a beard".

[102] Ar. *Eq.* 1373-1374, *Ra.* 422-424, cf. *'Ολκάδες* fr. 422 *PCG ap.* Σ *in* Ar. *Ach.* 122; Van Leeuwen 1901, 29; Murray 1933, 161-162; Coulon-Van Daele I 17, n. 1; Henderson 1991, 220.

[103] Ar. *Nu.* 355, *Ra.* 48, ib. 425-427, *Th.* 235; in the passage under discussion it goes with irony (although Murray (1933, 161-162) considers the possibility that it is in earnest) that Clisthenes is called "son of Sibyrtios", a famous owner of a wrestling school (Antipho fr. 68 Thalheim *ap.* Plu. *Alc.* 3; Van Leeuwen 1901, 29; Dover 1963, 11); Starkie 1909, 36; Coulon-Van Daele I 17, n. 1; Sommerstein 1980, 163; Henderson 1991, 214, 219.

clear that not only his face is smooth as a baby's bottom but also that his bottom is clean-shaven[104]. Thus the eunuch is ridiculed by Dicaeopolis for the same reason as the ape by the fox, viz. for lacking hair, on chin and buttocks, respectively[105], which disqualifies them for the role they play. Aristophanes' replacement of πυγήν with πώγων' is, unlike the *variae lectiones*[106] of the fable collections, not a "désexualisation" but, rather, a subtle παρὰ προσδοκίαν, in view of the numerous references to bottoms and scatological jokes in the preceding section[107]. This ape is really ἄπυγος!

The allusion fits in well with its context in two other respects, in that it is preceded by yet another literary parody[108] and followed by another comparison to a notoriously bald person[109]. It is impossible to tell whether Aristophanes parodied also the function of the fable in Archilochus' epod (the "pre-text"), since its original context has almost completely been lost.

The reaction of the audience (on stage) is disappointing: the messenger silences Dicaeopolis and invites the Persian deputation, in spite of its discomfiture, into the Prytaneum[110], which of course sticks in Dicaeopolis' throat (125-127).

17A2 Ar. *Pax* 127-134: Dung Beetle, Hare and Eagle (*Aes.* 3)
When in *Peace* Trygaeus appears ἐκ μηχανῆς[111], mounted on a giant[112] dung beetle, about to fly away to the gods, he is asked by one

---

[104] On the "*depilated anus*" typical of "effeminates", see Henderson 1991, 220.

[105] See above, Archil. 4F2, n. 68. Slightly differently McDermott 1935, 171: "Dicaeopolis means...that the eunuch has no beard, just as the ape has no rump" (likewise Starkie 1909, 37; Lilja 1980, 31, n. 2). Sommerstein 1980, 159, unconvincingly: "Dicaeopolis sarcastically pretends that Cleisthenes is too masculine to make a convincing eunuch." Chiasson (1984, 135) thinks that Aristophanes refers to "the hairy πίθηκος".

[106] Listed above, Archil. 4F2, n. 65.

[107] 81-82 ...εἰς ἀπόπατον ᾤχετο..., | κἄχεζεν ὀκτὼ μῆνας..., 83 τὸν πρωκτὸν... ξυνήγαγεν, 104 χαυνόπρωκτ', 106 χαυνοπρώκτους, 119 πρωκτὸν. Cf. Henderson (1991, 59, 191, 211, 220), not, however (παρὰ προσδοκίαν), mentioning the "désexualisation" under discussion.

[108] 119 ~ E. *Μήδεια* [?] fr. 858 Nauck[2] *ap.* Σ *in* Ar. lc; cf. Van Leeuwen 1901, 29; Schlesinger 1936, 297; Rau 1967, 16.

[109] 123 Strato; cf. Ar. *Eq.* 1373-1374, fr. 407; Henderson 1991, 215, 220.

[110] 123-125; Händel 1963, 241, n. 8; Whitman 1964, 60; McLeish 1980, 70.

[111] Dearden 1976, 77: "the best attested *mechane* scene in drama".

[112] 73 Αἰτναῖον μέγιστον κάνθαρον. On the size of the Etnean dung beetle, see Epich. fr. 76 Kaibel, A. fr. 233 Radt, S. fr. 162 Radt, Pl. Com. *Ἑορταί* fr. 36 *PCG*

of his little daughters[113]:

"But what idea have you, daddy, that has made you harness a beetle and ride up to the gods?"

He answers:

"In the fables of Aesop it was the only winged creature that I found had reached the god's realm."

He is interrupted[114] by his daughter's protests:

"O father, father, it is an incredible tale you tell, how an evil-smelling animal could come among the gods."

Trygaeus explains:

"It went once, long ago, because it was at feud with an eagle, on whom it was taking revenge by rolling eggs out of its nests."[115]

Trygaeus hereby tells his daughter (part of) the same fable as Philocleon was about to tell to his son (17F5)[116] and Aesop allegedly told to the Delphians. The fable[117] is unmistakably recognizable as such by its ascription to Aesop[118], two different terminological qualifications, and two introductory indefinite temporal adjuncts[119]. The terminological differentiation (see above, Chapter I.III, 1.3) subtly betrays an opposite evaluation of the fable by narrator and addressee: Trygaeus by terming his fable λόγος presents it in a neutral way,

---

ap. Σ *in* Ar. *Pac.* 73b; Greg. Cypr. M 2.24, and Σ, Van Leeuwen 1906, Platnauer 1964, and Sommerstein 1985 *ad* Ar. lc; Murray 1933, 57; Fraenkel 1962, 53-57; Davies-Kathirithamby 1986, 86-88.

113 On Aristophanic infant parts, see Russo 1962, 226-227. Rosen (1984, 392) gives 127-128 to a "Slave".

114 Rutherford (1883, p. XXXIV) skips this interruption.

115 124-132; translation by Sommerstein 1985, 15-17.

116 Hubbard (1991), pointing to other instances of "intertextual cross-referencing and self-allusion in Aristophanes" (pp. 150-151), notably *V.* 1029 ~ *Pax* 751-759, and improving an idea of Solomos (A., *The Living Aristophanes*, trans. Felheim, M., Ann Arbor, Michigan 1974, 141), argues that the (unfinished) fable at the end of the earlier play (17F5) is a "forward-looking allusion" (ib. 40) to the allusion near the beginning of the later one (17A2).

117 Nevertheless, it is termed a "parable" by Kovacs (1950, 22), a "folktale" by Dover 1972, 132, n. 1.

118 Holzberg (1993, 17) incorrectly calls the passage under consideration the "altesten Beleg" of the ascription of a fable to Aesop, as *Peace* was produced in 421 but *Wasps* in 422 BC. It has been seen above that already in the latter play (17F5) the same fable was ascribed to Aesop, not to mention the two references to Aesopic fables in general (G1a and c) and the occurrence of Aesop as a fable character in the same play (17F2); see above, Chapter I.III, 4.1.

119 133 πάλαι ποτέ (cf. 17F1, 17F4-5); paratragic, cf. S. *OT* 1043; Platnauer 1964, 78; Rau 1967, 95.

whereas his daughter by qualifying[120] it as a μῦθος emphasizes its fictitiousness and untrustworthiness (131 ἄπιστον).

Like an expert story-teller[121], Trygaeus evokes the entire fable by telling half of it and alluding to the other half: the "feud" (133 ἔχθραν[122]) refers to the beginning of the fable, in which the eagle violated the dung beetle's refugee, the hare, or, according to the scholiasts (17T20a-c, Tricl. 17T44ab), either broke his eggs or took away (and ate) his young[123]; "could come among the gods" (130 εἰς θεοὺς ἀφιγμένος; cf. 132 ἦλθεν εἰς θεούς) points to the fable's *dénouement*, in which the dung beetle flew up to Zeus, with whom the eagle had (in vain) sought refuge[124].

In the first place, and most obviously, the function of the given fable is explanatory: Trygaeus[125] explains to his daughter the choice of his novel steed by alluding to the scarab's flight to heaven in Aesop's fables. This explanatory function is stressed by various verbal parallels between the allusion and its context.[126] The observation that the scarab was not the only Aesopic fable character to have reached the gods—the eagle, for instance, preceded him—, which has even led some to emend 130 πετηνῶν into ἐπιγείων[127], is hypercritical[128]: what does matter is that the dung beetle's ascension was successful,

---

[120] In a paratragic way; cf. E. *IT* 1293, A. *Supp.* 277, E. *Hel.* 1520; Platnauer 1964, 78; Rau 1967, 95.

[121] Contra Dover (1972, 132, n. 1), who qualifies Trygaeus' reference to the fable as "distorted". Von Möllendorff (1994, 146) deduces from Trygaeus' summary report of the fable that "nur Kinder kennen ihn [den Logos] noch nicht", which seems to be a speculative generalization.

[122] Paratragedy; cf. A. *Supp.* 336, Platnauer 1964, 78; Rau 1967, 95.

[123] See Van Dijk 1995b, 146. Von Mollendorff (1994, 146, n. 6) thinks that it is possible to interpret 134 ἀντιμωρούμενος to refer to "der identische Modus der Rache" and to deduce from the prefix ἀντι- in Aristophanes that both birds broke each other's eggs (as in Σ), but this seems implausible.

[124] Archibald (1912, 67) thinks that "the Zeus scene...may have been added".

[125] Espino (1942, 39) seems to suppose that the *scarab* is called Trygaeus.

[126] f. 130 πετηνῶν ~ c. 76 and 135 πτερόν, 77 πετήσει, 93 πέτομαι, 95 πέτει, 103 πέτεσθαι, 126 and 141 πτηνὸς, 160 πτέρυγ'; f. 130 and 132 εἰς θεοὺς ~ c. 128 εἰς θεοὺς, 177 ἐγγὺς...τῶν θεῶν (cf. 70, 104 and 112 εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν (cf. 56)); f. 130 ἀφιγμένος ~ c. 68 ἀφικοίμην; f. 132 and 133 ἦλθεν ~ c. 111 ἀπέρχεται.

[127] Tyrrell, *CR* 1, 1887, 131 (apparently followed by Baker 1969, 586); contra: Platnauer 1964, 78). On the omission of the article, see Rau 1967, 95.

[128] Sharpley (H., *The Peace of Aristophanes*, Edinburgh/London: Blackwood 1905, 69) raises a more natural objection: "a member of the coleoptera is as much πετεινόν as an eagle".

whereas the eagle's was not[129]. In a way, the explanatory function of the fable in *Peace* links up with its original (whether primary or secondary[130]) aetiological function: it may originally have explained why dung beetles do not appear when eagles nidify; in *Peace* it explains the dung beetle's long-lasting[131] presence, dominating the action[132].

Secondly, and not surprisingly, the allusion to the fable has a comic function. In itself, the entire scene is paratragic: Trygaeus' flight on the dung beetle parodies Bellerophon's on Pegasus in Euripides' *Bellerophon*[133], as is indicated by several equestrian metaphors applied to the dung beetle[134], and as is unmistakably[135] clear from Trygaeus' two comparisons of the dung beetle to Pegasus[136], from his daughter's two explicit references to Euripides' tragedy[137], and from two paratragic references[138]. More generally, the tragic form of stichomythy[139] and the *sermo tragicus*[140] are also parodied. The paratragedy is the more comic since the noble steed is replaced with

---

[129] Sommerstein 1985, 140-141. It is the other way round in a medieval fable (*Aes.* 650), which Aristophanes is unlikely to have been acquainted with (contra Davies-Kathirithamby 1986, 12, n. 35) and which Adrados (1987a, 539) derives from *fab. aes.* 259 Hausrath (*Aes.* 230; Adrados 1987a, 246-247, 429).

[130] See above, Semon. 5F2, n. 103.

[131] Davies-Kathirithamby (1986, 11) observe that the prologue of *Peace* is "the most famous scene composed for a dung-beetle in Greek (or indeed any other nation's) drama".

[132] This is not to say that the plot is based upon the fable, as some seem to infer (contra Adrados 1988b, 262, 264; Holzberg 1993, 21; cf. Baker 1969, 586: "The *Peace* of Aristophanes is the greatest existing memorial to Aesop").

[133] Not Archilochus' fable of the Fox and the Eagle (Rutherford (1883, p. XXXIV, n. 1), nor the Etana myth (Duchemin 1957, 281-282; 1960a, 261). Cf. Van Thiel 1971, 113.

[134] 74 ἱπποκομεῖν, 75 αὐτὸν [*sc.* τὸν κάνθαρον] ὥσπερ πωλίον, 81 ἱππηδὸν...ἐπὶ τοῦ κανθάρου, 126 Πτηνὸς...πῶλος (see Rau 1967, 95), 181 (and Eust. (17T38)) Ἱπποκάνθαρος; cf. Taillardat 1965, 479 (adding 153 βουκολήσεται); Dearden 1976, 79; Sommerstein 1985, 138.

[135] This may have been done because six years had elapsed between the parodied tragedy and the paratragic comedy; Dearden 1976, 79.

[136] 76 Πηγάσειον, 154 Πήγασε; Van Leeuwen 1906, 20-21; Schlesinger 1936, 302; Duchemin 1957, 278; Platnauer 1964, 74, 80; Rau 1967, 90-91; Dearden 1976, 79; Sommerstein 1985, 138-139.

[137] 135-136 Πηγάσου, τραγικώτερος; 146-148 Εὐριπίδῃ, τραγῳδία; Van Leeuwen 1906, 30; Schlesinger 1936, 302; Platnauer 1964, 79; Rau 1967, 95; Dearden 1976, 79; Sommerstein 1985, 141.

[138] 140-141, 154-155; Schlesinger 1936, 302; Platnauer 1964, 79-80; Rau 1967, 95-96; Sommerstein 1985, 141.

[139] 124-148; Rau 1967, 12, 93, 96.

[140] See Rau 1967, 12, 90-97; cf. Silk, M. "Aristophanes as a Lyric Poet", *YCS* 26, 1980, 135.

a stinking insect[141]; the latter's comic success, as opposed to the former's tragic failure, might be called just another instance of the *Verkehrte Welt*-motif. Trygaeus' initial failure when trying to reach heaven by means of ladders seems yet another paratragic reference to Bellerophon's fall from Pegasus.[142]

Likewise, Aristophanes' use of Aesop's fable might be termed "parafabulistic": an originally metaphorical element of the fable, the dung beetle, is taken literally, magnified, in fact visualized on stage.[143] Not only the dung beetle but also its flight is visualized on stage: Trygaeus is hoisted up by the crane (80-81), makes an air trip[144]—which is not without danger, as is clear from the actor's address to the stage mechanic[145]—, and finally lands at the heavenly gate (177-178).

The comic opportunities offered by the fable, more particularly by its protagonist, are fully exploited. After having alluded to the fable, Trygaeus, answering his daughter's anxious questions, puns on at least two[146] other meanings of κάνθαρος: in case of controlled ditching, the beetle will serve as a Naxian boat[147] driven by Trygaeus' private paddle[148] and will put into Beetle's port[149] in Piraeus. The prologue is pervaded by scatological humour with reference to the

[141] Davies-Kathirithamby 1986, 12.

[142] 69-71; cf. Harriott 1986, 121.

[143] Cf. Newiger 1957, 112: "bildliche Rede ist...in Handlung umgesetzt". On "die wörtlich genommene Metapher" as "besonders wichtiges Element der Komik", see ib. 103; cf. Dobrov 1990, 218.

[144] As is clear also from the anapaestic metre in 82-101 and 154-172; Russo 1962, 216; Rau 1967, 90-91; Dearden 1976, 78, 159. McLeish (1980, 48) is able to calculate the duration of the flight as "anything up to 2 minutes".

[145] 174; Van Leeuwen 1906, 33-34; Platnauer 1964, 82. For this rupture of the dramatic illusion, see Russo 1962, 217; Rau 1967, 97; Chapman 1983, 6.

[146] Van Leeuwen (1906, 30) and Platnauer (1964, 79) assume that 143 puns on yet another meaning of κάνθαρος, "cup", Trygaeus producing the libation bowl handed over to Hermes in 424. Compare also the pun on the name of Aristophanes' *collega proximus* in 1 (see Sommerstein 1985 *ad loc.*).

[147] 143 Ναξιουργὴς κάνθαρος; cf. Σ *ad loc.* The name of the boat is explained by Platnauer (1964, 79: "Such boats may have had three oars on either side and so resembled the six-legged beetle") and Coulon-Van Daele (II 104, n. 3: "des bateaux appelés *escarbots* (des *cargo-boats*))".

[148] 142 πηδάλιον, for which see Σ, Van Leeuwen 1906, Coulon-Van Daele, Platnauer 1964, and Sommerstein 1985 *ad loc.*

[149] 145 Κανθάρου λιμήν, "a Cantharo heroe quodam denominatus" (Van Leeuwen 1906, 30; cf. Platnauer 1964, 79; Sommerstein 1985, 141; Σ *ad loc.*

malodorous insect's eating (and drinking) habits.[150] These jokes largely amount to the slaves preparing the dung beetle's food not being able to stand the stench, and Trygaeus begging the audience not to have the dung beetle change his course by producing his favourite dish. Besides, Trygaeus comically adds an economic motive to his allusion to the fable as an explanation for his riding precisely a dung beetle: the driver can recycle his own food as fuel for his transport.[151] Since the reeking glutton at first (1-81) remains out of sight in the σκηνή and only in 82 appears ἐκ μηχανῆς, which increases the dramatic tension[152] and causes a surprise effect, Aristophanes has (and does of course not miss) the opportunity to lash out at a homonymous rival comedian[153] and at Cleon, his political arch-enemy[154], by insinuating *they* practise coprophagy. The opening scenes are thematically connected with the rest of the play, in which smell, food and drink are recurrent motifs developing from the negative to the positive, thus symbolizing the transgression from war to peace.[155] With respect to this, the mention of an evil-smelling beetle[156] later in the play by an opposer of peace is telling.

Not only the flight but also the landing and the journey back are comic. The dramatic illusion of the landing is in fact absurd: Try-

---

[150] 1-49, 99-101, 138-139, 151, 158, 162, 164, 172; Henderson 1991, 193-194. For a critical zoological analysis of Aristophanes' description of the dung beetle's coprophagy, see Davies-Kathirithamby 1986, 88-89. Rosen (1984, 395-396; cf. Henderson 1991, 22) compares scatological references in Hipponax.

[151] 138-139 (cf. Σ *ad* 137; Van Leeuwen 1906 and Sommerstein 1985 *ad loc.*). This motive is additional and comic (cf. Rau 1967, 96), not, as Newiger (1957, 112) suggests, the only one, nor seriously meant.

[152] Dearden 1976, 77-78; Landfester 1977, 191-192: "Rätselspannung"; cf. Harriott 1986, 122.

[153] 1 with Sommerstein 1985 *ad loc.*

[154] 47; cf. 269-272, 313-320, 647-656, 753-758, *Ach.* 377-382, 502-503, *Eq. passim* (Paphlagon), *V.* 894sqq (Dog), 1284-1291; Van Leeuwen 1906, Platnauer 1964, and Sommerstein 1985 *ad loc.*; Henderson 1991, 192. Rosen's derivation (1984, 391) of αἰνίσσεται from "αἶνος, 'animal fable'" (see above, Chapter I.III, 1.1) seems too far-fetched here—it just means "this hints at"; cf. Landfester 1977, 191.

[155] Smell: 529-538, 862, 869b; food: 869c, 1312-1314, 1357; way of eating: 1309-1310 ~ 33-37; drink: 1358 (πίῃς ~ 49 πιεῖν); Whitman 1964, 109-110 (who does not mention the drink motif). On the contemporary political situation, see e.g. Platnauer 1964, pp. IX-XI; Sommerstein 1985, pp. XVsq.

[156] 1078 ἡ σφονδύλη...πονηρότατον βδεῖ; Whitman 1964, 110. On the identification of the σφονδύλη, see Platnauer 1964 and Sommerstein 1985 *ad loc.*, Davies-Kathirithamby 1986, 95. Borthwick (1968, 138) identifies the farting creature with a weasel.

gaeus' *ascension* on the dung beetle is dramatized by the *lowering* of the μηχανή depositing Trygaeus on stage.[157] This might be interpreted as a visualization of the typically comic *Verkehrte Welt* motif. As for the return journey, when Trygaeus proposes to set out on the voyage back, in the company of Opora and Theoria[158], he has to walk home[159], allegedly because the dung beetle has gone away[160] to carry (like Pegasus) Zeus' thunderbolt, but presumably, and more prosaically, because three persons exceeded the maximum load of the μηχανή[161]. In itself, the tiny creature's apotheosis, already hinted at previously[162], parodies both Euripides' *Bellerophon*, as is apparent from a paratragic quotation[163], and "the motif of heroic divinization"[164]. The dung beetle's new job does not, as Trygaeus quite reasonably fears, mean starvation, for Ganymedes will supply its food.[165] The insect's new career reminds one of the fable previously alluded to: both in the comedy and in the fable Zeus changes the dung beetle's life forever, albeit in another way—by altering its daily activities and season, respectively.

Thirdly, in addition to these explanatory and comic functions, Trygaeus' use of the fable seems to preserve something of its original, metaphoric, function.[166] In *Peace* Trygaeus flies up to heaven mounted on a dung beetle to call Zeus to account in the name of Greece, like the dung beetle in the fable flew up to Zeus to punish the

---

157 Cf. Russo 1962, 217.

158 On these personifications, see Newiger 1957, 108-111 and "War and Peace in the Comedy of Aristophanes", *YCS* 26, 1980 (transl. by Radford, C., of "Krieg und Frieden in der Komödie des Aristophanes", in: *ΔΩΡΗΜΑ: Hans Diller zum 70. Geburtstag...*, Athens 1975, 175-194), 225-226.

159 With characteristically Aristophanic rupture of the dramatic illusion; Dover 1972, 135.

160 Somewhere after 181; Dover 1972, 135; Dearden 1976, 78; cf. Harriott 1986, 122. The dung beetle is still once referred to in 866.

161 Lesky 1971, 493; Dearden 1976, 78.

162 42; Whitman 1964, 107, explaining the pun Διὸς (σ)καταιβάτου; Coulon-Van Daele (II 100); McLeish 1980, 95; Σ (c), Van Leeuwen 1906, Platnauer 1964, Sommerstein 1985 *ad loc.*; Henderson 1991, 194.

163 722 (E. fr. 312 Nauck[2]); see Σ, Van Leeuwen 1906, Platnauer 1964, and Sommerstein 1985 *ad loc.*, Schlesinger 1936, 303; Rau 1967, 97.

164 Whitman 1964, 107. One might also compare the scarab's association with the Sun-god in Egyptian mythology.

165 723-724; see Σ, Van Leeuwen 1906, Platnauer 1964, and Sommerstein 1985 *ad loc.*; Davies-Kathirithamby 1986, 12. Gods do not defecate.

166 Erasmus' application (17T64b; *adagium* separately published as *Scarabeus*, Basel: Froben 1517), stressing the scarab's negative aspects, is quite different; cf. the discussion by Blackham 1985, 63-64.

eagle in the name of the hare[167] (although the latter is omitted in the scholiasts' versions). This implies that Trygaeus compares himself, Zeus and Greece to the dung beetle, the eagle and the hare of the fable, respectively. It is noteworthy that the parts played by the two characters which occur both in the fable alluded to and in its context, viz. the dung beetle and Zeus, have slightly changed in the context when compared with the fable: the dung beetle's role has changed from the flying avenger to the transport on which the avenger flies, Zeus' role from the accused eagle's protector and the arbitrator of the conflict to the one who is himself accused.

17A3 Ar. *Av.* 652-653: Fox and Eagle (*Aes.* 1)

In addition to the fable discussed above (17F6), *Birds* contains two allusions to fables (17A3-4). The first of these runs thus:

"...in Aesop's fables there's some story told about the fox, how she went into partnership with an eagle with unhappy results."[168]

This is an allusion to a story which is explicitly said to occur among "Aesop's fables" (651 ἐν Αἰσώπου λόγοις); besides, it is characterized by the introductory time adjunct "once" (653 ποτε; as in 17F1, 17F4-5, 17A2). The fable here ascribed to Aesop's telling is, as the scholiast (17T17a; G66b) rightly observes, in fact pre-Aesopic by circa one century: it already occurred in an epod by Archilochus (4F1).[169] The incompatibility of a partnership between two species from different elements is a typical fable theme.[170]

The fable[171] is alluded to by Pisthetaerus to explain to Tereus, the hoopoe, why he and Euelpides, after a zigzag (647-648), shrink from complying with his invitation to enter his nest[172] (641-643, 646). Im-

---

[167] f. 133 κατ' ἔχθραν, 137 κἀντιτιμωρούμενος (paratragic, cf. E. *El.* 849, *IT* 357; Platnauer 1964, 78; Rau 1967, 95) ~ c. 57 λοιδορεῖται τῷ Διὶ, 59 τὴν 'Ελλάδα, 62 Ὦ Ζεῦ, τί δρασείες ποθ' ἡμῶν τὸν λεών; 93 Ὑπὲρ 'Ελλήνων πάντων, 105 'Ερησόμενος ἐκεῖνον [*sc.* τὸν Δία] 'Ελλήνων πέρι, 107-108 Γράψομαι | Μήδοισιν αὐτὸν [*sc.* τὸν Δία] προδιδόναι τὴν 'Ελλάδα.

[168] Translation by Sommerstein 1987, 91.

[169] Cf. Handford 1954, p. XVI; Sommerstein 1987, 239. Dunbar (1995, 417-418) detects "a verbal echo of Archil." in ἐκοινώνησεν αἰετῷ (653 ~ Archil. 4F1a.2 καἰετὸς ξυνεωνίην).

[170] E.g. *fab. aes.* 150 Hausrath (*Aes.* 145; Adrados 1987a, 160); Babr. 99 (*Aes.* 335; Adrados 1987a, 364); Cascajero (1991, 50-51; 1992, 57).

[171] Hausrath 1909, col. 1718: "Märchen". It is not "reproduite en entier" (contra Janssens 1955, 17).

[172] For a possible sexual *double entendre*, see Pozzi 1985-1986, 122; cf. Arrowsmith 1973-1974, 166. Thompson (1936, 100) takes "the Hoopoe's pressing invitation to

mediately before the allusion to the fable Pisthetaerus had already formulated his objections directly: he wonders how he and his fellow can unite with the birds, the latter having, but they themselves lacking, wings (648-650). As the hoopoe appears not to recognize the seriousness of this objection (651 καλῶς), Pisthetaerus now illustrates his objection by alluding to the fable of the fox and the eagle. Apparently, he counts on his interlocutor's (and Aristophanes on the audience's) knowledge of the fable and leaves it to him to remember the rest of the story, which is hinted at by one word (653 φλαύρως)[173]: the fox, *precisely for lacking wings*, was unable to revenge himself on the eagle, who had proved to be an unfaithful partner but could, and of course did, *fly* out of reach. Pisthetaerus implicitly compares himself and his fellow to the fox, and the hoopoe to the eagle, primarily[174] in that the former lack, and the latter are equipped with, wings. Pisthetaerus' second, more specific, formulation of his objection is almost exactly parallel to his first, general wording: τὴν ἀλώπεχ' finds its counterpart in ἐγώ τε χοὐτοσὶ...οὐ πετομένω, ἐκοινώνησεν in ξυνεσόμεθ', and αἰετῷ in ὑμῖν πετομένοις, whereas φλαύρως answers the question πῶς...; Thus Aristophanes' use of the fable might again be termed "parafabulistic": the original metaphor of the fable, viz. the possession or lack of wings, like the dung beetle in *Peace* (17A2), is taken literally and visualized on stage. Hereby the metaphoric fable is reduced to an illustrative example. Closely related to this explanatory function, the fable also has a critical, or rather: corrective, function, in that it serves to correct the answer which the hoopoe gave to Pisthetaerus' seemingly open (649 φράσον...πῶς), but in fact rhetorical, question: the hoopoe's airy καλῶς is contradicted by Pisthetaerus' own φλαύρως; both adverbs occur at the same pregnant position at the beginning of the verse.

Apparently, the example is more impressive than the outright statement, for now the hoopoe removes Pisthetaerus' fear by holding out the prospect of the possession of wings to the Athenians when

---

Peisthetairus (641) that he should enter in" to be a hint at "the nauseous reputation of the nest" in relation to the Tereus myth.

[173] Dunbar's qualification (1995, 418) that "the Fox 'fared wretchedly in its alliance with an Eagle' *only for a short time*" (my italics), aiming at its quick revenge, does not alter the fact that their *partnership* was wretched enough, which is what matters here.

[174] Whitman (1964, 181) looks for another *tertium fabulae*: "Peithetaerus is already a fox in cleverness".

they chew some herb[175] (654-655). The hoopoe's sudden willingness might be explained by assuming that he remembered all too well how the fable alluded to ended with the dreadful vengeance of the fox upon the eagle with the help of Zeus.[176] Pisthetaerus is reassured now that he gets his own way; *exit* Pisthetaerus, together with Euelpides, into the hoopoe's nest (656-657) through the central door of the σκηνή[177]. Again, Pisthetaerus has persuaded a bird by means of a fictitious fable featuring a bird: the hoopoe changes his mind by means of a fable about an eagle, like the birds did by means of one about a lark (see above, 17F6).

It might be noted here that Atticus' paraphrase (4T13ab) of Archilochus' fable (4F1), preserved by Eusebius (4T17bc), aptly expresses Pisthetaerus' use of the fable in *Birds*. Curiously enough, Atticus imagines that the fox would have to "grow...wings [πτερά], which she by nature does not...and thus take off from the earth and fly up into the air [ἀναπτέσθαι]" to reach the eagle. A few lines before, however, the philosopher had disposed of this as "impossible" (ἀδύνατον), and thus concludes: "As long as each species remains in its own order, partnership [κοινωνία] between terrestrial and celestial creatures is impossible." Typically enough, the comedian does dramatize this ἀδύνατον, subverting the natural order. A Babrian fable proposes a more easily performable solution to the same problem: a lion stipulates from an eagle to have himself pinioned [ὠκυπτέρω] as a condition for a partnership [κοινωνὸς].[178]

At a higher level, the allusion to the fable is connected with the key motif of *Birds*: wings, which "mark the liberalization of the hero from the common lot of humanity"[179]. Thus the allusion to the fable has an important structural function in the play: it prepares the two protagonists' utopian, but typically Dionysiac (for really ecstatic)[180],

---

175 Identified by Thompson (1936, 98, 100) with "the magical ἀδίαντον".

176 This is not to say that "Peisthetaerus 'has the whole fable in mind (not just the first half of it)'" (Sommerstein 1987, 239), for he does not allude to the fable to warn the hoopoe not to harm them, but, rather, to emphasize his need for wings, which is illustrated by the first half of the fable (depicting the fox as unable to reach the eagle), but not so much by the second half, which in fact shows that wings are not indispensable to get one's revenge.

177 Dearden 1976, 21.

178 Babr. 99 (see above, n. 170). Archibald (1912, 67) overlooks the difference between the solutions offered by Aristophanes and Babrius.

179 Whitman 1964, 182; cf. Pozzi 1985-1986, 119; Dunbar 1995, 166.

180 See e.g. Latacz 1993, 33-34.

transition of the border between human beings and birds, which their interlocutor has already traversed by his metamorphosis of Tereus into a hoopoe[181]. Later in the play, the motif of the utopian symbiosis of beasts and birds, *in casu* wolves and ravens, recurs in a mock-oracle; the impossibility of such a society is here stressed by a connection with a proverbial expression of an non-existing locality, which, curiously enough, various ancient authors ascribe to Aesop.[182] The same motif underlies also the compound "horse-cock" (from Aeschylus' *Myrmidons*; see below, 17A4), denoting a fabulous creature, which the birds' chorus mockingly apply to a cavalry officer promoted to the rank of bird.[183]

17A4 Ar. *Av.* 807-808: Eagle (*Aes.* 276a)[184]

Shortly after the parabasis (676-800) Aristophanes *expressis verbis* announces a citation from Aeschylus[185]:

"We've thus compared ourselves, to quote from Aeschylus:
'T'is not by others but by feathers of our own'"

The scholia (17T18a-d) and the *Suda* (17T32b) explain that the second iambic trimeter is a literal quotation from a fable[186] which occurred in Aeschylus' *Myrmidons* (12F1), more particularly from the *réplique finale* spoken by the eagle when noticing that the arrow by which he had been shot was equipped with his own feathers.

By means of this allusion to Aeschylus' Libyan fable Pisthetaerus addresses his fellow Euelpides. Both have just re-entered (801) in birds' costumes; during the preceding parabasis (676-800), they have apparently been chewing the hoopoe's magic root which causes

[181] Newiger 1957, 84; Sommerstein 1987, 3: "All boundaries and categories seem to be obliterated"; Dobrov 1990, 218-219.

[182] 967-968 'Ἀλλ' ὅταν οἰκήσωσι λύκοι πολιαί τε κορῶναι | ἐν ταὐτῷ τὸ μεταξὺ Κορίνθου καὶ Σικυῶνος, -; Σ *ad loc.*; Ath. 5, 219a; *Suda*, Ει 337 Adler; Zen. 3.57 (*Aes.* T43). Cf. Diogenian. 2.60 V; Lib. *Ep.* 371, ib. 834; Eust. *Il.* B 572; Macar. 3.58; Van Leeuwen 1902, 148; Sommerstein 1987, 262; Dunbar 1995, 544-545.

[183] 800 ἱππαλεκτρυών (on this fabulous creature, see Van Leeuwen 1902 ("*equigallus*") and Sommerstein 1987 *ad loc.*); cf. *Pac.* 1178, *Ra.* 944.

[184] An earlier version of the subsection to follow appeared in *Kleio* (Van Dijk 1993c, 150-152).

[185] On this "type of indication used by Aristophanes to mark a parody", consisting in mentioning "the name of the poet without the name of his work", see Schlesinger 1937, 296.

[186] Merry, W.W., *Aristophanes. The Birds*, II[4], Oxford: Clarendon P 1904 (repr. 1966), 45: "simile".

wings to grow[187]. The Athenians' avian appearance is extremely laughable, as the *bomolochos* explicitly remarks[188]. The allusion to the fable is preceded by two hilarious ornithological comparisons by which they deride each other: Pisthetaerus likens Euelpides to "a goose painted on the cheap"; the latter retorts by comparing the former to "a blackbird with a bowl pluck", respectively[189]. The allusion summarizes this scene, and has an explanatory function: it mentions the source of their mocking comparisons—nothing else but their own wings.[190] It is clear that Pisthetaerus compares himself and his friend to the eagle; all three have wings, as is clear from an obvious verbal parallel[191]. Thus a third metaphorical bird is ingeniously added to the preceding two: a fable about an eagle serves to explain why the two Athenians compared themselves to a goose and a blackbird.

The allusion also has a comic, paratragic and "parafabulistic", function. The paratragedy, which is clearly marked[192], consists in the contrast between the two situations to which the fable is applied in the "text" at hand and its "pre-text". The original deeply tragic context of the fable in Aeschylus—Achilles' *lamento* at his beloved Patroclus' dead body—almost diametrically opposes its hilarious context in Aristophanes. Structurally, however, the use of the fable of the eagle in Aeschylus' tragedy and Aristophanes' comedy is comparable:

---

[187] Landfester 1977, 251.

[188] 801-803; on this rupture of the dramatic illusion, see Chapman 1983, 13.

[189] 805-806; translations by Sommerstein 1987, 105; Chapman (1983, 13) renders: "a portrait of a goose by an artist who couldn't afford the paint!" and "a blackbird with a crew-cut!"; cf. Holzinger's explanations (K., "Erklärungen umstrittener Stellen des Aristophanes", *SAWW* 208.5, 1928, I 60-63. Dearden (1976, 135) deduces that Euelpides' wears a "Long-nosed mask" and Pisthetaerus a "Short-nosed mask"; Dunbar (1995, 487-488) deduces that the former has white wings whereas the latter's "were black, but not his mask". An alternative "interlocuzione" of 801-806 is argued for by Marzullo (B., "L'interlocuzione negli 'Uccelli' di Aristofane", *Philologus* 114, 1970, 192; "Aristoph. *Av.* 801-808", *MCr* 87-91). Dobrov's interpretation (1990, 217-218) of the χὴν γεγραμμένος in 805 as a reversal of the Homeric ἔπεα πτερόεντα seems overingenious. On the first comparison, see Taillardat 1965, 480 with n. 1.

[190] Cf. Zanetto 1987, 248.

[191] f. 808 τοῖς αὑτῶν πτεροῖς ~ c. 785 and 798 πτερά, 786 ὑπόπτερος, 789, 792 and 796 κατέπτετο, 791 and 795 ἀνέπτετο, 803 τοῖσι σοῖς ὠκυπτέροις, 804 ἐπτερωμένος; strikingly enough, all these words occupy the same, viz. ultimate, position in the verse; in addition 687 ἀπτῆνες, 697 πτερύγοιν, 704 πετόμεσθα, 788 ἐκπτόμενος, 795 πτερυγίσας, 797 ὑπόπτερον.

[192] Dunbar (1995, 92, 147, 488), comparing 159 and 1225, may be right in preferring 807 -μεσθα to -μεθα as a marker of paratragedy (cf. ἁλισκόμεσθα in A.'s fable just after the verse quoted by Ar.).

both times the dying eagle's *réplique finale* is quoted at dramatic turning points; Patroclus' death leading to Achilles' *peripeteia*, and the two Athenians' metamorphosis after the first parabasis, the "heart of the play"[193], respectively. There might be yet another correspondence between the use of the fable in "text" and "pre-text", in that the first person plural in which the eagle speaks bears on both the speaker and the addressed: Achilles and Patroclus[194], and Pisthetaerus and Euelpides, respectively. In addition, the use of the fable might again (like 17A2-3) be termed "parafabulistic" in that an originally metaphoric element of the fable, viz. the feathers, is taken literally and even visualized on stage.

At a higher level, the allusion is also connected with its context in a wider sense. First, by its theme: feathers[195]. The scenes following and preceding the parabasis are corresponsive; the parabasis in between provides the link. The Athenians' exit and entrance take place through the same door of the σκηνή[196], through which they disappear as wingless humans but emerge as winged birds. It is noteworthy that both immediately before their exit and immediately after their entrance Pisthetaerus alludes to a fable about feathers and featuring an eagle. Thus Aristophanes' eagle can in a sense be said to perish by his own feathers indeed: by alluding to a fable about a winged eagle (17A3) Pisthetaerus has himself implored for the feathers by which he and Euelpides now ridiculously resemble the eagle shot by his own feathers. The parabasis[197] accompanies, and provides a prelude for, the Athenians' metamorphosis: when the two mortals are growing wings (cf. 785 φῦσαι πτερά) off stage, the birds vividly depict how mortals would profit from the possession of wings, and thus accentuate the difference between winged birds and wingless humans; typically enough, the latter are once addressed as "unfledged" (687 ἀπτῆνες). Later in the play, the key motif of feathers (and bird-men) recurs at full strength, when Pisthetaerus and Euelpides have difficulty satisfying their bird-mad fellow-citizens' demands for feathers.[198]

---

[193] Whitman 1964, 186. 801 ταυτὶ τοιαυτί is interpreted to mark the transition from part I to II.

[194] Provided that the interpretation of A. 12F1 suggested above is plausible.

[195] Cf. Newiger 1957, 86; see above, Ar. 17A3.

[196] Dearden 1976, 21.

[197] Analysed by Murray 1933, 46-48; Newiger 1957, 81-83; Whitman 1964, 182-186.

[198] To quote only from 1271-1469 (on this passage, see Whitman 1964, 192-194): 1287 ἐπέτονθ', 1303 πτέρυγες, πτεροῦ, 1306, 1307, 1310, 1325, 1375, 1418 and

Secondly, *Birds* contains, besides the allusion under discussion, two other paratragic references to Aeschylus' *Myrmidons*; one of these is the very last words of the chorus' parabasis preceding the flighted mortals' entrance.[199] Thus the paratragic allusion to Aeschylus' fable is prepared for and announced by a parodic reminiscence to the same tragedy. These three paratragic references are not only literary-historically but also thematically related: all are ornithological. The citation occurring just before the quote from Aeschylus' eagle fable applied to comic bird-men mentions a legendary mixture of a wingless and a winged animal (800), the other (1420) is altered so as to contain the words "wings" (even twice), like the quote from the fable.

17A5 Ar. *Lys.* 695: Dung Beetle, Hare and Eagle (*Aes.* 3)

After *Wasps* (17F5) and *Peace*[200] (17A2) Aristophanes uses the fable of the dung beetle, the eagle and the hare[201] a third time in *Lysistrata*:

"I'll midwife you as the beetle did the breeding eagle!"[202]

An abbreviated (and often slightly altered) form of this trochaic line was included in the paroemiographical collections.[203]

1420 (*bis*) πτερῶν, 1311, 1330, 1424, 1463 and 1469 πτερὰ, 1334 πτερώσεις, 1343a and 1421 πέτεσθαι, 1344 and 1374 πέτομαι, 1355 ἐκπετησίμους, 1361 πτερώσω, 1365 πτέρυγα, 1369 ἀποπέτου, 1373 Ἀναπέτομαι, πτερύγεσσι, 1383 and 1409 πτερωθεὶς, 1384 ἀναπτόμενος, 1390 πτεροδόνητα, 1392 πετηνῶν, 1402 πτεροδόνητος, 1406 πετομένων, 1410 πτεροποίκιλοι, 1412 and 1415 τανυσίπτερε, 1426 πτερύγων, 1436 πτέρου, 1437 πτερῶ, 1438 πτερώσειας, 1439 ἀναπτεροῦνται, 1443 ἀναπτερῶσθαι, 1446 πτεροῦνται, 1449 ἀναπτερώσας, 1453 πτεροῖς, 1456 πέτωμαι, 1459 πέτει, 1464 Πτερὼ, 1466 πτερυγιεῖς These references are unlikely to be obscene puns (cf Henderson's suggestion (1991, 128-129))

[199] 800 ξουθὸς ἱππαλεκτρυών and 1420 Πτερῶν, πτερῶν δεῖ ~ A fr. 134 and 140 Radt, Van Leeuwen 1902 and Sommerstein 1987 *ad locc.*, Schlesinger 1937, 300-301, 304 n 50

[200] Hubbard (1991, 151, n 35) argues that the allusion "serves as an intertextual cross-reference to the *Peace* in the parabasis of the *Lysistrata* . as part of the Old Women's advocacy of a peace policy, like (ib 194) the "Boeotian eel" (*Lys.* 702) alludes to the poet's "other prominent peace play[s]" (*Ach* 880-894)

[201] Not a "durch Archilochos besonders verbreiteten Fabel" as Von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff (1927, 165) asserts

[202] Translation by Sommerstein 1990, 87

[203] Ἀ(ἰ)ετὸν κάνθαρος μαιεύσομαι Eust (17T38) παροιμία, Macar (17T51); *Mantiss prov* (17T59), ~ μαιεύεται Zen (17T7), Diogenian (17T19ab), Greg Cypr (17T39ab), Apostol 17T53 (Arsen (17T57)), Erasm (17T64a), rightly rejecting the *varia lectio* μαίεται, Kohler 1881, 4-5, 99, misleadingly adducing Ael. *NA* 10 15, cf. Crusius 1890, 34, Archibald 1912, 68, Wienert 1925, 113, n 2, Nøjgaard 1964, 437; Van Thiel 1971, 113, Von Mollendorff 1994, 147-148, LSJ *s* μαιεύω, where, however, the proverb had better come under 2 "cause delivery to take place" or 4. "*deliver*", not under 3. "c acc *bring to the birth* , *hatch*", as the dung beetle does not hatch an eagle

Through an allusion to this fable a member of one semichorus, consisting of women, addresses a member of the other semichorus, consisting of men, who try to stop the women's double plan[204] to end the (Peloponnesian) war by a sex strike and the seizure of the Acropolis. From the grammatical structure of the sentence, more particularly from the predicative position of the fable characters (cf. Σ *ad loc.* (17T19b)), it is clear that the woman compares herself and her male opponent to the dung beetle and the eagle, respectively, the former agreeing with the subject, the latter with the object.[205]

The use of the main verb (μαιεύσομαι) is remarkable—a typically comic ἀπροσδόκητον[206]—in five respects. In the first place, it implies intrusion of the given fable into its context: strictly speaking, it applies to the fable, not to its context. Secondly, it is used ironically, or rather sarcastically: the dung beetle did not "hatch" the eagle's eggs: he did make the eaglets hatch out[207], it is true, but somewhat prematurely. Thirdly, the verb is not used in its proper sense: by nature its object is of the female sex, but here a woman "delivers" a man.[208] Fourthly, bearing in mind that both semichoruses have stripped[209], an obscene interpretation of the verb is plausible: the woman insinuates that she will do to her opponent's testicles, which the men themselves mentioned as a symbol of virility some lines before, what the dung beetle did to the eagle's eggs[210]. Finally, assuming that the verb is used in this obscene sense—three additional arguments will be given below—, the use of the verb might again (like 17A2-4) also be termed "parafabulistic": an originally metaphorical element of the fable alluded to, *in casu* breaking the eagle's eggs, is taken literally and even visualized, or, rather (and happily for the person involved): the prospect of a visualization of the metaphor is menacingly held out.

---

[204] See, e.g., Hulton, A.O., "The Women on the Acropolis: A Note on the Structure of the *Lysistrata*", *G&R* 19, 1972, 32-36; Vaio, J., "The Manipulation of Theme and Action in Aristophanes' *Lysistrata*", *GRBS* 14, 1973, 369-380.

[205] αἰετὸν ~ σε, κάνθαρος ~ μαιεύσομαι.

[206] Cf. Van Thiel 1971, 113, who, however, notices only one aspect.

[207] Cf. Von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff 1927, 165.

[208] Cf. Van Thiel 1971, 113.

[209] 662 τὴν ἐξωμίδ' ἐκδυώμεθ' (cf. Dearden 1976, 114), 686 χἠμεῖς, ὦ γυναῖκες...ἐκδυώμεθα; Henderson 1980, 165, 201.

[210] Blaydes, F.H.M., *Aristophanis Lysistrata*, Halle (Saale) 1880, 248; Henderson (1987 *ad loc.*, comparing 661 ὅστις ἐνόρχης ἔστ' ἀνήρ; 1991, 125-126, speculating: "perhaps with reference to punishments for adultery"); Sommerstein 1990, 193; cf. Von Möllendorff 1994, 146-147; contra: Van Leeuwen 1903, 100, n. 6.

Since, on the one hand, the use of μαιεύομαι causes these surprise effects *in this particular context*, and, on the other, the proverb referred to above retains this verb (thrice (Eust.[211], Macar., *Mantiss. Prov.*) even in the same person), the assumption that the proverb derives from the passage under discussion, and not *vice versa* (thus Σ (17T19a)), is plausible. What is more, Eustathius first narrates the fable *in extenso*, in the course of which he refers to Aristophanes' dung beetle in *Peace* (κατὰ τὸν τοῦ Κωμικοῦ ἱπποκάνθαρον (*Pax* 181); 17A2), and then derives the proverb from it (ἐκ τούτων δή).

The function of the allusion is to threat: the woman warns the man not to put a finger on her and threatens that, if he does, he will not be able, in spite of his apparent physical superiority, to escape the drastic vengeance which she will take upon him, just as not even Zeus could protect the mighty eagle from the tiny dung beetle's terrible revenge. The allusion fits in well with its context: it is one of the revolting women's virile counterthreats[212], put in the future tense, in the second *antode* (682-705), by which they parry the men's threats in the second *ode* (658-681) of the *agon*[213] (614-705). More particularly, one of the other forceful counterthreats (683-684) is, like the allusion to the fable, an animal metaphor: the female semichorus threaten to "*go the whole hog*"[214]. Also, the above interpretation of the female semichorus' use of the fable alluded to as a sexual innuendo becomes even more plausible if its context is taken into consideration: a gross sexual threat would be the appropriate means to respond to the men's preceding obscene *double entendres*[215]; moreover, the women's preceding animal metaphor also has an obscene meaning[216]. Thirdly, it is noteworthy that earlier in the play[217] the female chorus leader uses yet

---

211 Van der Valk *ad loc.*, however: "Nescio num ille locus [Ar. *Lys.* 695] Eust. menti obversaretur."

212 683-685 λύσω τὴν ἐμαυτῆς | ὗν ἐγὼ δή, καὶ ποήσω | τήμερον τοὺς δημότας βωστρεῖν σ' ἐγὼ πεκτούμενον.

213 Analysed by Von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff 1927, 60, 160; Händel 1963, 103-104; Henderson 1980, 201 and 1987, 148sqq; cf. Russo 1962, 262; Dover 1972, 151.

214 LSJ *s.* ὗς (3) also give an equivalent, less adequate, if more polite, translation: "I'll give my *rage* vent". Van Leeuwen 1903 and Henderson 1987 *ad loc.* compare Luc. *Salt.* 4 ὡς κάρχαρόν τινα ἔλυσας ἐφ' ἡμᾶς τὸν σαυτοῦ κύνα; cf. Von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff 1927, 165; Taillardat 1965, 208.

215 677-678 ἱππικώτατον γάρ ἐστι χρῆμα κἄποχον γυνή, | κοὐκ ἂν ἀπολίσθοι τρέχοντος; Henderson 1980, 202; 1987, 160; 1991, 165.

216 Henderson 1987, 161; 1991, 132.

217 363 κοὐ μή ποτ' ἄλλη σου κύων τῶν ὄρχεων λάβηται; Van Leeuwen 1903 *ad loc.*, 100 n. 6; Henderson 1991, 124.

another animal metaphor when explicitly threatening her male antagonist with emasculation, which is thus qualified as a bestial act. In a larger sense, the *agon* embroiders on the *parodos* in which the female chorus quench the fire by means of which the male chorus try to smoke them out from the Acropolis.[218] The allusion to the fable is just one of the many and sundry threats and counterthreats which the two sexes (semichoruses) hurl at each other's heads.[219]

However, in comic contrast with the preceding abusive language, as the women's spirit appears to be willing but their flesh weak, and as the situation both in Athens and in Sparta proves to have become unbearable, both semichoruses finally unite and the belligerents are pacified[220]—in the end, they appear to be less irreconcilable than the dung beetle and the eagle.

17A6 Ar. *Ra.*[221] 1431-1432: Lion Cub and Man (not in *Aes.*[222])

"Best if the city rear no lion's whelp,
But if it rear one, it must serve his ways."[223]

These lines from *Frogs* were famous already in antiquity: they are quoted by Plutarch (17T5), included in the *Anthologia Palatina* (17T1 = [A.] 23A1), and translated into Latin by Valerius Maximus (17T4) and Erasmus (17T62). The first line has again (like 17A5) become proverbial.[224] The doublet of 1431, which occurs in most manuscripts (but is omitted in some)[225], is problematical: it seems almost as difficult for modern editors to decide between a and b in the text as for Dionysus between Aeschylus and Euripides in the play.[226] Curiously

---

[218] 254-386; Lesky 1971, 497-498; Henderson 1980, 201 (and 190-195); cf. Händel 1963, 22-26; Whitman 1964, 203, 212.

[219] Especially 354-381.

[220] See, e.g., Whitman 1964, 206sqq; Dover 1972, 159-160; Henderson 1980, 205sqq.

[221] Wache (1919/1920, 417) considers *Frogs* (like *Birds*) to be a "Tierfabel in dramatischer Form".

[222] See above, A. 12F2, n. 18.

[223] Translation by Whitman 1964, 254. Murray (1908, 102) versifies: "No lion's whelp within thy precincts raise; | But, if it *be* there, bend thee to its ways!"

[224] Macar. (17T52); Erasm.: *sententia proverbialis*; Nöldeke 1922, 373, n. 2; Radermacher 1954, 339, n. 2; cf. Adrados 1987a, 159.

[225] See Eberline, N., *Studies in the Manuscript Tradition of the Ranae of Aristophanes*, Meisenheim am Glan: Hain 1980, 106-107, 157, 159.

[226] Whitman (lc) apparently brackets the second verse of the doublet (likewise Kock 1881, 207; Van Leeuwen 1896, 208; Murray 1908, 102; Nöldeke 1922, 372, n. 1; Murray 1933, 120; Radermacher 1954, 135; Marr 1970, 54, n. 1; Dover 1972, 181; Del Corno, D., *Aristofane. Le Rane*, [Milano]: Mondadori 1985, 142, 243). Cou-

enough, Plutarch preserves the latter (variant), Valerius Maximus the former, the epigram, the *Suda* (17T33ab) and Erasmus both. The last line contains the typically fabulistic indefinite τις (as in 17F2, 17F4).

The lines quoted above are spoken by the Aristophanic[227] Aeschylus[228]. It is plausible to interpret them as paratragic and to assume that Aristophanes has Aeschylus allude[229] to the fable[230] told at length by the chorus in the tragedian's *Agamemnon* (12F2): the author of the "pre-text" has become the narrator of the "text" under consideration. The comic allusion and the tragic fable display a similar dichotomy: 1431 (whether a or b) corresponds to the strophe, 1432 to the antistrophe of *Agamemnon*; the first half of both the allusion and the fable refers to a young lion, the second half to an adult one. The wording of the first line (especially a) of the allusion closely resembles the *incipit* of the fable: λέοντος σκύμνον (b λέοντα) ~ λέοντος ἶνιν, ἐν (b 'ν) πόλει ~ δόμοις (in Aeschylus the *house* in the fable has been

lon-Van Daele (IV 152; see Coulon 1931, 22), Stanford (1963a, 63), Arrowsmith (1973-1974, 134, n. 5) and Moorton (1988, 351), however, bracket the first, whereas Bloedow (1991, 63) vaccilates. Erbse (1956, 276-277; followed by Sicking 1962, 176; Newiger 1985, 431, 446; cf. Stanford 1963a, 194; contra: Dover 1993, 372) brackets neither but transposes 1431a after 1429, giving it to Euripides (to which Μάλιστα would point back; cf. Bloedow lc, although differently). Other solutions: the tautology betrays a revision of the play (see Stanford lc and p. XXVI n. 25; Dover lc: "I assign 1431 *a* to 404 [BC] and 1431 *b* to 405"); one of the two is by Aeschylus, inserted by a scholiast (see Stanford 1963a, 194); one of the two is interpolated from Eupolis' *Δῆμοι* (Radermacher 1954, 340; see Fraenkel 1950, II 342; Stanford lc; cf. Dover lc); one of the two is a gloss (Coulon 1931, 8; contra: Sicking lc, n. 3); the latter (ib. n. 4) proposes (and rejects (like Kock (1881, 206) and Coulon (1931, 22, n. 3 contra Fritzsche and Pernice) already did)) yet another solution (cf. Σ), giving 1431b to Dionysus; neither is to be bracketed, 1431b referring to one (Fritzsche; contra: Kock lc, Coulon lc), or *the* (general) Leon (contra: Kock lc; Merry, W.W., *Aristophanes. The Frogs*, II, Oxford: Clarendon P 1884[5] (repr. 163), 71; Stanford lc); Sheppard (1910, 258; cf. Σ) does not see any problem, assuming that Aeschylus is interrupted by the audience after 1431a and has to begin again in 1431b; Σ *ad loc.* considers the possibility that Aeschylus is interrupted by Euripides (thus Cantarella 1974, 298, n. 32), Dionysus, or the chorus.

[227] Not the real one; Nöldeke 1922, 372; Schlesinger 1936, 308; Rau 1967, 123, n. 17. Therefore, A. fr. 452** Radt (Dumortier 1935, 150) and *AP* 10.110 are not listed in the Synopsis below as Aeschylean allusions.

[228] Contra: Marr 1970, 55 (contra: Newiger 1985, 432, n. 12), giving the 1431-1432 to Euripides (and 1427-1429 to Aeschylus instead).

[229] Cornford, F.M., *Thucydides Mythistoricus*, London 1907 (repr. New York: Greenwood P 1969), 193, with some overoptimism: "no Athenian could miss the reference" (in a chapter entitled "The Lion's Whelp"); Dodds 1959, 268; Moorton 1988, 351; cf. Arrowsmith 1973-1974, 134, n. 5.

[230] Cornford (lc) terms Aristophanes' allusion a "parable", and Aeschylus' fable a "simile".

shown to symbolize, besides the *house* of Atreus, the *city* of Troy), τρέφειν ~ ἔθρεψεν. Compare also the last verse in Aristophanes and Aeschylus: ἐκτραφῇ ~ προσεθρέφθη, τις ~ τις.[231]

The allusion constitutes the deceased Aeschylus' answer in Hades to Dionysus' question what he would advise Athens to do with Alcibiades (1430). This is one of the two decisive political questions which Dionysus puts (1422-1423, 1426) to Aeschylus and Euripides, between whom he cannot yet decide (1411-1413) even after a comic tragedy contest, to determine whom he will take back to earth to save Athens (1418-1419). The question is to the point in two respects: first, in general, both competitors have themselves acknowledged before, that giving political advice is an important poetical criterion[232]. Secondly, and in particular, Alcibiades was a hot issue at the time of the production of the play (405 BC)[233], now that he was in his second exile[234] after being held responsible for the naval defeat during his absence off Notium (407 BC; cf. X. *HG* 1.5.11-17).

The allusion to the fable has a persuasive and a paratragic function; these two functions are in fact interrelated. To begin with the latter, it is, first (and obviously), paratragic that the original author of the fable appears on the stage as its narrator. Secondly, Aristophanes typifies Aeschylus by having him answer in metaphorical language[235], *in casu* an allusion to a fable. The allusion in fact conveys two metaphors, one per verse: one animal (λέοντος σκύμνον/λέοντα) and one nautical metaphor (ὑπηρετεῖν[236]). The animal metaphor seems to have been common in classical Greek.[237] It is noteworthy that both in the comic and in the original tragic context the metaphor of the brought-up whelp finds a counterpart in a childbirth metaphor,

---

[231] The parallel structure and wording could be adduced against Fraenkel's statement (1950, II 342): "There is nothing to show that the advice of Aeschylus in Ar. *Frogs*...alludes to the employment of the αἶνος in the chorus of the *Agamemnon* and not rather to the underlying αἶνος itself."

[232] 1008-1012 (cf. 1501-1503); Murray 1933, 119; Lesky 1971, 501.

[233] See Stanford 1963a, pp. XIV-XVII; Dover 1993, 370-371.

[234] He had been recalled in 411 BC from his first exile after his alleged involvement in mutilating the Hermae in 415 BC (Plu. *Alc.* 18sqq).

[235] Radermacher 1954, 341; cf. Hurst 1971, 239; Bloedow 1991, 63.

[236] See Richardson, L.J.D., "ΥΠΗΡΕΤΗΣ", *CQ* 37, 1943, 55-61; Moorton 1988, 353.

[237] Cf. Hdt. 5.92 (parodied by Ar. *Eq.* 1037-1040), E. *Supp.* 1222-1223 (cf. Collard 1975 *ad loc.*), Pl. *Grg.* 483e-484a (see the Appendix below), A. 12F2, Phaedo 51F1ab; Van Leeuwen 1896, 208; Dyson 1929; Fraenkel 1950, II 342; Dodds 1959, 268-269; Stanford 1963a, 194; Adrados 1965a, 4.

which in *Frogs* is added by Dionysus to his question about Alcibiades to express that Athens does not know what to do with him.[238] Thirdly, the first variant of the doublet contains a poetic word (σκύμνον), which is typical of (Aristophanes' typification of) Aeschylus[239]. Finally, the paratragedy serves not only to characterize (and parody) Aeschylus' style but also to distinguish his style from Euripides': the latter's straightforward[240] answer sharply contrasts with the former's indirect answer. Likewise, the antithetic style of Euripides' answer is typical of *his* style[241].

Besides paratragedy, the allusion to the fable also conveys practical advice. It is clear that Aristophanes has Aeschylus (like Plato (49A1; possibly) Socrates) compare Alcibiades[242] to the lion of the fable in question. In general, a lion seems to have been an apt symbol for an Alcmaeonid.[243] More particularly, *this* lion, whimsical (τοῖς τρόποις) and "bred in town", suits Alcibiades, the brilliant *enfant terrible* of Athenian politics, well: a glance at his *curriculum vitae* (or a cursory reading of Thucydides and Plutarch) proves that he could be, and had already been, both Athens' and Sparta's most powerful ally but also their most dangerous enemy.[244] Strictly speaking, the "city" of the first line does not belong to the fable alluded to but to its context: πόλις just refers to Athens[245], as just before (1420, 1423, 1429) and after (1436) the allusion (and *passim*). The Aristophanic Aeschylus, if somewhat ambiguously[246], recommends the Athenians to obey to,

---

[238] 1423 δυστοκεῖ; Stanford 1963a *ad loc.*: "'is in difficult labour with the question'"; cf. Dover 1993 *ad loc.*; cf. LSJ *s.* δυστοκέω. For Aeschylus, see above, A. 12F2, n. 43.

[239] Rau 1967, 123.

[240] 1427 Μισῶ; Stanford 1963a, 193-194, comparing E. fr. 905 Nauck[2]. Cf. Hurst 1971, 239; Bloedow 1991, 62.

[241] 1427-1429 ὠφελεῖν βραδὺς-βλάπτειν ταχύς, πόριμον αὑτῷ-τῇ πόλει [cf. Bloedow 1991, 62] ἀμήχανον; Radermacher 1954, 341; Stanford 1963a, 194. It is remarkable that both commentators only point to half of these antitheses, and that the first two antitheses are parallel, the second two chiastic.

[242] Not (if 1431*a* is accepted) Alcibiades' father (contra Coulon (1931, 22) in the wake of Willems, using (and rejecting) this identification as a (false) argument against this line; contra: Sicking 1962, 176, n. 2).

[243] Plu. *Per.* 3.2 and 17T5; Stanford 1963a, 194; Moorton 1988, 351.

[244] See Th. 6-8, *passim*; Plu. *Alc.*; Kiechle, F., "Alkibiades (2)", *DKP* 1, col. 262-264, with further literature; Bloedow 1991.

[245] This seems to be overlooked by Noldeke (1922, 372), who considers ἐν πόλει to be a "Zugabe des Komikers".

[246] This has misled Coulon-Van Daele (IV 152, n. 4) into interpreting the Aristophanic Aeschylus as "défavorable[s] au retour d'Alcibiade"; contra: Marr 1970, 55, n. 1; Moorton 1988, 352. On Aristophanes' caution in dealing with this emotive

casu quo to recall, Alcibiades. This advice makes the paratragedy analysed above truly parodic: Aeschylus' use of the fable in *Frogs* and in *Agamemnon* is entirely different[247]: unlike the tragic Aeschylus, his comic *alter ego* does not use the fable of the grown-up lion's cub to illustrate the ruin of the city (of Troy) and the house (of Atreus) but to advise the city (of Athens) to serve this whimsical tyrant.[248]

The nautical metaphor (ὑπηρετεῖν) specifies (and clarifies) Aeschylus' advice: it is a hint that the comedian has the tragedian advise Athens to (re-)appoint Alcibiades as their *admiral*—he recommends his fellow-citizens to "serve" Alcibiades "by rowing", "to serve under him in the fleet".[249] This advice is in accordance with other statements by Aeschylus later and the chorus-leader earlier in the play, tantamount to a plea for not refusing to use the best citizens, bearing no malice against them for crimes which they committed in the past.[250] As Athens was in dire need of capable *strategoi*—only two out of eight escaped execution—after the recent Pyrrhic victory off Arginusae (406 BC), references to which naval battle (and to other ones) occur throughout the play[251], eyes were naturally directed to Alcibia-

---

subject, see Segal 1961, 237, n. 44. On the playwright's changed attitude towards Alcibiades, see Sommerstein, A.H., "Aristophanes and the Events of 411", *JHS* 97, 1977, 124; differently, however, Cantarella 1974, 308: "l'opinione di Aristofane riguardo al richiamo di Alcibiade rimane deliberatamente incerta". Dover (1993, 371), referring to Hatzfeld (J., *Alcibiade*, Paris 1940, 329-331), observes: "The constant reminders of the overland procession [to Eleusis] throughout the parodos (cf. p. 61) could not fail to be a reminder also of the effect of Alkibiades' leadership [407 BC] on Athenian morale."

[247] Cf. Dover 1993, 372. The contrast is perceived by Marr (1970, 55), who, however, uses this as a (false) argument to give Aeschylus' advice to Euripides and *vice versa*. Whitman (1964, 254; contra: Moorton 1988, 351-352), reading Aristophanes against the background of Aeschylus, speculates that the former has the latter prophesy by the allusion to the fable of the lion cub that "the city [Athens, like Troy] has nursed its own doom", which is a *vaticinium post eventum*, or: intertextuality from the modern reader's viewpoint (cf. e.g. Pfister 1985, 20; Still-Worton, "Introduction", in: *eadem* 1990, 2).

[248] Cf. *Sudam* (17T33ab) μὴ ἀνατρέφειν φρόνημα, (·) ἐὰν δὲ ἀνατρα(ε)φῇ, μὴ ἐρεθίζειν, ἀλλὰ τιθασ(σ)εῦσαι; Erasm. (17T62): *Tyrannus aut ferendus est, aut non recipiendus.*

[249] Moorton 1988, 353-355 (the *second* translation being from 354).

[250] 686-705, 718-737, 1454-1455; cf. 1446-1450; Sheppard 1910, 253-254; Wills, G., "Aeschylus' Victory in The Frogs", AJPh 90, 1969, 54; Moorton 1988, 355; cf. Murray (1908, 133).

[251] 33 ἐναυμάχουν, 49-50 Κἀναυμάχησας; Καὶ κατεδύσαμέν γε ναῦς | τῶν πολεμίων ἢ δώδεκ' ἢ τρεισκαίδεκα, 191 νεναυμάχηκε (listed by Plu. *Prov.* 2.7), 693 τοὺς...ναυμαχήσαντας; Whitman 1964, 237 with n. 29, 252 with n. 90. Cf. 204 ἀσαλαμίνιος, 430 ναυμαχεῖν, 698 ἐναυμάχησαν, 702 ξυνναυμαχῇ, 1440 ναυμαχοῖεν.

des[252], who had already proven his qualities as supreme commander of the Athenian fleet by his naval victory off Cyzicus (410 BC; X. *HG* 1.1.11sqq). Moreover, earlier in the play two other nautical metaphors occur, expressing that Athens has reached a critical point[253]. This seems to indicate that Aristophanes acknowledged that Athens' future would be fought out at sea; furthermore, the play abounds in references to boats—one (Charon's) is even staged (180-270)—and to the sea[254], and clearly expresses (expecially in the finale) concern about how Athens can be rescued[255].

Finally, the specific interpretation of Aeschylus' advice along these lines seems to be confirmed, or hinted at, by the fact that the allusion to the fable is framed by two invocations (by Dionysus) of gods whose jurisdiction is relevant in the matter: Poseidon (1430; cf. 491) immediately before, "Zeus the Saviour"[256] immediately after the reference to the lion cub (alias Alcibiades).

The purport of Aeschylus' answer again (like its style) diametrically opposes Euripides' plain expression of his hatred for Alcibiades, whom he characterizes as a "self-interested traitor"[257]. In itself, this divergence of views exemplifies Dionysus' preceding description[258] of Athens' attitude towards Alcibiades as a Catullean *odi et amo avant la lettre*. Aeschylus' balanced and cautious advice seems a more ad-

[252] D.S. 13.68.4-6; Sheppard 1910, 253; Coulon-Van Daele IV 152, n. 2; Stanford 1963a, p. XVII, 193; Moorton 1988, 355.

[253] 361 τῆς πόλεως χειμαζομένης, 704 τὴν πόλιν...ἔχοντες κυμάτων ἐν ἀγκάλαις (Archil. fr. 213 West *ap.* Σ *ad loc.*); Stanford 1963a *ad loc.*; cf. Moorton 1988, 355.

[254] 52 ἐπὶ τῆς νεὼς, 139 πλοιαρίῳ, 140 ναύτης, 179 τὸ πλοῖον, 188 ἔμβαινε, 189 Εἴσβαινε, 197 ἐπὶ κώπην, πλεῖ, 198 'πι κώπην, 204 ἀθαλάττευτος, 205 ἐλαύνειν, 206 ἐμβάλῃς, 269 τὼ κωπίω, 270 Ἔκβαιν', τὸν ναῦλον, 304 Ἐκ κυμάτων, γαλῆν (ἀπροσδόκητον for γαλήν'; see Stanford 1963a *ad loc.*), 362 ναῦς, 365 ταῖς τῶν ἀντιπάλων ναυσὶν, 664 ἁλὸς ἐν βένθεσιν, 1065 τριηραρχεῖν, 1207 ναυτίλῳ πλάτῃ, 1309 θαλάσσης, 1438 πελαγίαν ὑπὲρ πλάκα, 1465 τὰς ναῦς, 1479 ἀποπλεῖν; see also above, n. 251; on the boat trip, see e.g. Russo 1962, 328; Dover 1972, 179-180.

[255] 378 τὴν Σώτειραν, 380-381 τὴν χώραν | σῴζειν, 386 σῷζε, 1152 Σωτὴρ, 1419 ἡ πόλις σωθεῖσα, 1436 περὶ τῆς πόλεως ἥντιν'...σωτηρίαν, 1448 σωθείημεν ἄν, 1449-1450 πῶς | ...σῳζοίμεθ' ἄν; 1458 Πῶς...τις ἂν σώσειε...πόλιν, 1501 σῷζε πόλιν τὴν ἡμετέραν.

[256] 1433 (and 738) Νὴ τὸν Δία τὸν σωτῆρα; Sheppard 1910, 254.

[257] Murray 1908, 132-133; Whitman 1964, 255.

[258] 1425; paratragic from Ion's *Φρουροί* (*TragGrF*19F44; Schlesinger 1936, 308); quoted by Plutarch (17T5); cf. Sheppard 1910, 253; Stanford 1963a, 193; Moorton 1988, 345, 350-351; Dover 1993, 371.

equate approach to the complex problem than Euripides' blunt rejection[259] and may thus be taken to prelude to Aeschylus' final victory.

Even after this question about Alcibiades has been answered, Dionysus cannot decide since both answers please him, though for different reasons: one (Aeschylus') is wise, the other (Euripides') clear (1433-1434)[260]. Therefore he puts to the two tragedians a second political question, again concerning the rescue of Athens (1435-1436). Finally, Dionysus (rather subjectively (1468)) chooses Aeschylus (1471, 1473), who is urged by Plutus to save Athens by good counsels[261] (1501-1502).

History teaches us that the Aristophanic Aeschylus' advice was not taken: Alcibiades was not recalled; the next year (404 BC) both he and Athens found their tragic end.

18. *Apollophanes*

18F1 Apolloph. fr. 9 *PCG ap.* Ael. *NA* 6.51: Ass and Snake (*Aes.* 458)

For Aelian's reference (18T1) to a version by Apollophanes of the aetiological fable about the Ass and the *Dipsas* the same goes—*mutatis mutandis*—as for Dinolochus (16F1; q.v.).

19. *Strattis*

19A1 Stratt. fr. 75 *PCG ap.* Zen. 2.93: Weasel, Man, Aphrodite and Mouse ? (*Aes.* 50)

Zenobius (19T1; likewise Ps.-Plu. *Prov.* 2.1), dealing with the proverb "a chiton to a weasel", first gives its fuller form: "A saffron-coloured

[259] Moorton 1988, 351.

[260] On this identification of σοφῶς and σαφῶς (and in 1413), see Σ and Radermacher 1954 *ad loc.*; Erbse 1956, 277; Hurst 1971; Dover 1972, 187; Moorton 1988, 356; Dover 1993, 372. Conversely: Sheppard 1910, 258, n. 20; Handel 1963, 324, n. 13; Bloedow 1991, 63. Murray (1908, 133) cuts the knot: "I do not think that any real distinction is drawn between σοφῶς...and σαφῶς".

[261] Tarkow, T.A., "Achilles and the Ghost of Aeschyles in Aristophanes' 'Frogs'", *Traditio* 32, 1982, 2: "the selection of Aeschylus for the return to life and to the task of helping Athens confront the problem of Alcibiades in particular and the problem of imminent final collapse in general."

robe does not suit a weasel"[262], and then derives it from (Ἐπειδὴ) a fable, of which he gives a summary report: "A weasel became a woman by Aphrodite's providence but ran in her saffron-coloured robe after a mouse." The missing details of the story—the initial love of a weasel for a man, the appearance of a mouse at the wedding party or during the wedding night, the final metamorphosis of the bride back into a weasel—can be suppleted from other versions[263].

Zenobius (but not Plutarch) adds: "Strattis makes mention of this." From the (feminine) gender of this demonstrative pronoun it is clear that, witness Zenobius, the *proverb* (παροιμία), not the fable[264], occurred in Strattis. It is less clear, however, whether or not the comedian, just like the paroemiographer, used the proverb as a condensation of[265], or allusion to[266], the fable, for it is possible that, conversely[267], the fable was made up by Zenobius (or some other paroemiographer) to explain an already existing proverb. It is noteworthy that one Byzantine paroemiographer lists a proverb which does clearly derive from the fable: "a mouse will expose the weasel up until then a bride"[268]. The fable illustrates the unchangeability of nature[269], which in itself is a common fable theme, and can be connected with the association of the weasel with childbirth, which possibly originates from the (hence allegedly viviparous) creature's habit

---

[262] The shorter variant is also listed by Diogenian. 3.82, 6.98; Macar. 2.91; Apostol. 5.25 (Arsen. 14.45); cf. Lib. *Ep.* 1416.1. The longer form occurs also in Macar. 6.65; cf. Eust. *Opusc.* 11.11 (p. 63 Tafel). Apostol. 5.21 (Arsen. 14.43) and the *Suda* (γ 34 Adler; cf. ibid. 35) also have both versions.

[263] Babr. 32 (partially quoted by the *Suda*, β 40 and ε 1483 Adler; alluded to by Jul. *Ep.* 82, 444B), *fab. aes.* 50 Hausrath; Greg. Naz. *Carm.* 2.1.12.701-708; *Tetr.* 1.39; *Pa.Bodl.* 76 Chambry; *Dod.* 76 ibid.; Tz. *H.* 9.937-943 (11); Eust. *Il.* Γ 17; Mich. Chon. *Ep.* 116; Theod. Prodr. *Or. paup. prov.* (*Notices...* 8.2.85); Leon. Dati 31; Laur. Vall. *Fac. mor.* 3 (*Aes.* 50; *TMI* J1908.2; Παπαδημητρίου 1987, 111-113); Adrados 1987a, 73 (incomplete) and 1994, 112 (the prototype of *El cuento erótico*).

[264] Cf. LSJ *s.* χιτώνιον; contra Keller 1861-1867, 345; Rutherford 1883, p. XLIV, n. 6; Wienert 1925, 45; Jedrkiewicz 1989, 237 n. 37, 364 n. 56, cf. 417 n. 54.

[265] Contra Benfey 1859, I 376; Crusius 1890, 35-36 and 1894a, 302-305; Thiele, G., "Phadrus-Studien II. Gotterschwanke und Novellen", *Hermes* 43, 1908, 347; Keller 1909, 167.

[266] Contra Rohde 1888, 304; Hausrath 1909, col. 1726. Zielinski (1889, 156) proceeds with due caution.

[267] Thus Van Thiel 1971, 110-112.

[268] Arsen. 36.6 (Apostol. 11.89a), *Anecd. Gr.* III 223 Cramer: Μῦς γαλῆν ἐλέγξει τὴν τέως νύμφην.

[269] See above, A. 12F2 with n. 30; cf., e.g., Greg. Naz. *Carm.* 2.1.12.708: Τὸ γὰρ πεφυκὸς οὐ ταχέως μεθίσταται; cf. Wienert 1925, 86. The proverb is not equivalent to 'pearls before swine', as LSJ (*s.* γαλέη 4.) state.

of carrying its young in its mouth[270], and which, in its turn, underlies the Greek myth of Galinthias' (Galanthis', Galen's) metamorphosis into a weasel (γαλῆ) for hastening Alcmene's parturition of Heracles[271], as well as the weasel's names in various languages, especially Middle and New Greek νυμφίτζα[272] ("little bride") and Spanish *comadreja* ("little midwife").

However this may be, the function of the proverb (perhaps alluding to the fable) in Strattis remains unclear since neither the original fragment[273] nor its quondam context survive.

Conclusion

This conclusion focuses upon Aristophanes, as the functions of the (originally aetiological) fables in Dinolochus and Apollophanes, and of the allusion in Strattis (if any), cannot be ascertained for want of context. Even here, however, some caution is needed since the accompanying stage action is not always entirely clear (17A1; cf. 17A4).

Aristophanes' use of fables is highly original. It might be termed "parafabulistic" in that metaphors are taken literally and even visualized (17A2 (dominating the action on stage) -17A4; cf. 17A5); fables are used for other ends (an aetiology is used as a persuasive instru-

---

[270] Graves 1960, II 89. Keller's explanation (1909, 166) is less plausible: "In der Tat kam es bisweilen vor, daß eine in den Wehen liegende Frau durch das plotzliche Voruberhuschen eines Wiesels erschreckt wurde und so die Geburt eine Beschleunigung erfuhr." More vaguely Van Thiel 1971, 112: "man fühlt sich an ein kaprizioses und zartliches Madchen erinnert".

[271] Nic. *Heteroeumena* 4, fr. 60 Gow-Scholfield *ap.* Ant. Lib. *Met.* 29; Ov. *Met.* 9.285-323; cf. Ael. *NA* 12.5, 15.11; Keller 1909, 166; cf. Graves 1960, II 87, 89-90; Geisau, H. von, "Galinthias", *DKP* 2, col. 678. Keller (1861-1867, 344-345; 1909, 166-167) compares *Panchatantra* 3.14 (Ryder, A.W., *The Panchatantra*, Chicago/London: U of Chicago P 1964 (=1925), 353-357: "Mouse-Maid Made Mouse"; cf. Lucas, H., review of Hausrath-Marx 1912 (1922^2), *Sokrates n.s.* 7 (73), 1919, 354, n. 3; Adrados 1979a, 715) about the double metamorphosis of a mouse; contra: Rohde 1888, 304-305; Zielinski 1889, 157, n. 2.

[272] Du Cange, Ch. du Fresne, *Glossarium ad scriptores mediæ et infimæ Græcitatis*, Lyon: Anisson/Posuel/Rigaud 1688 (repr. Graz: Akademische Druck- u. Verlagsanstalt 1958), sv: "Mustella, Catus, Felis"; Zielinski 1889, 157; Keller 1909, 165, comparing also Portuguese *doninha*, Italian *donnola* and *benula*, and French *belette*; Borthwick 1968, 136; Van Thiel 1971, 112, observing (n. 45) that, conversely, *mustela* is used as pet name for a girl in *CIL* 10.5646.

[273] Crusius (1894a, 304-305) speculatively ascribes to Strattis *Lex. Coisl.* 64 (p. 127 Gaisford) ἀπέδυ τὸν κροκωτὸν ἡ γαλῆ.

ment (17F6)); the context may intrude into the fable (17F4, 17A6) or *vice versa* (17A1, 17A5).

All kinds of comic resources are exploited: wordplay (17F6, 17A2), ἀπροσδόκητον (17A1, 17A5), obscenities (17A2, 17A5; cf. 17A1), literary parody (17A1 (Archilochus); paratragedy in 17A2 (Euripides), 17A4, 17A6 (Aeschylus), and possibly 17F6 (Philocles); cf. 17A2 (Kantharos), "comic iteration" (17F2, 17F4), incongruity of fable and context (17F2-3, 17F5), deliberate misinterpretation of a fable's function (17F6).

The fact that six fables are only alluded to and another two immediately cut off after a stock introduction (17F1, 17F5) implies widespread acquaintance of the fables with the audience. This can be connected with the popularity of "Aesop" (G2; 17F2, 17F5-6 (two third-degree narratives), 17A2-3).

The fable may metaphorically represent its narrator plus the addressee (17F2-3, 17F5, 17A3-5) plus (or (17A6): only) a third party (17F4, 17A1-2). The functions may differ from satirical (17A1) to explanatory (17A2 (plus comic and critical), 17A4 (and structural)), and from persuasive (17A3 (and structural); 17A6 (and paratragic)) to threatening (17A5). The addressees' reactions may differ: negative in 17A1-2, 17F1-5 (understandably), positive in 17F6, 17A3, 17A6. The fable may be related to the play's dominant theme (17A3-4, 17A6; cf. 17A2).

The metre often is the iambic trimeter (17F1-5, 17A1-4, 17A6), but anapaestic (17F6) and trochaic (17A5) tetrameters also occur.

The five fables in *Wasps*—a unique fable cluster—are closely interrelated. All are told by Philocleon, but there are two chiastic arrangements to be observed. To begin with, the first and the last fable are told to Bdelycleon, who, however, cuts off the fable in its very first sentence, whereas in between are three complete fables told to accusers, comprising a *réplique finale* which bears on both context and fable, to the effect that the respective addressee had better refrain from taking legal action. Secondly, the Aesopic and Sybaritic fables told by Philocleon to comply with his son's previous advice (G1c) are chiastically arranged, too; in addition, Philocleon makes slight variations between the two specimens of each species: the first Aesopic fable has Aesop as a character, the last as the narrator; the two Sybaritic fables in between feature a male and a female Sybarite, respectively. Bdelycleon's advice, however, proves not to work, because Philocleon only partially shapes his fables in accordance with

the profile given by his son: Philocleon's fables, it is true, are witty (1159 γέλοιον)—though at their addressees' expense—but far from polite (1258 ἀστεῖον), which is not only due to his inebriety but also to his unteachability.

On a higher level, the fables occurring in *Wasps* more closely interconnect the so-called dicastic and symposiac parts of the play.[274] At the same time, a typical reversal can be observed. It has been noted above (G1a) that Philocleon somewhat self-confidently tells Bdelycleon how in the courts the accused try to appease the judges by telling comic fables. After the symposium, the world is turned upside-down: out of the court the former dicast now tries, but fails[275], to appease his accusers by telling fables which are so overtly insulting that they only add to the addressees' fury. In itself, such a *Verkehrte Welt* motif is typical of comedy in general, and of Aristophanic comedy in particular.

The three (allusions to) fables in *Birds*, too, closely belong together. Again, all are told by the play's protagonist (*in casu* Pisthetaerus). They may be said to be in style by virtue of their avian appearance: all have birds as characters, two are also told to birds. The first two are ascribed to Aesop and have a persuasive function[276]. The two allusions are thematically and structurally corresponsive and interconnected by the parabasis.

Finally, it is noteworthy that Aristophanes uses one and the same fable (*Aes.* 3) in three different plays (*Wasps, Peace, Lysistrata*), but each time with a different function (to persuade, to explain, and as a threat, respectively). In itself, this singular multiplicity may suffice to demonstrate the untenability of functionally monistic genre descriptions (see above, Chapter I.I), the more so since the fable in question is a secondary aetiology.

---

[274] 1-1008 and 1122-1537, respectively; see Vaio 1971, 342-343; Banks 1980, 81-82.

[275] Contra Schwarzbaum (1979, p. XIII): "All laugh and the trouble is ended."

[276] Cf. Van Dijk 1993c, 150-151.

CHAPTER SIX

HELLENISTIC POETRY

20. *Callimachus*

20F1 Call. *Iamb.* 2(fr. 192 Pfeiffer).1-15: Zeus, Animals and Men (*Aes.* 431)

The fable[1] which fills Callimachus' second *Iamb* is usefully[2] summarized by the *Diegesis* (20T9; *PSI* 1219):

"All other animals shared speech with mankind, until the swan went to the gods with the request that old age should be abolished, and the fox ventured to assert that Zeus was not ruling justly. From that time Zeus transferred their power of speech to men, and they became loquacious."[3]

This prose summary, supplemented by the indirect tradition on the one hand and a remarkably similar, if not identical, fable by Philo (*Conf. Ling.* 6-8) on the other, permits a partial[4] reconstruction of Callimachus' choliambic fable, which has been preserved fragmentarily on a papyrus (*POxy.* 1011). The *incipit* of the fable (1-3), whose very first line serves, as usual, as a lemma in the *Diegesis*, is quoted by Clement of Alexandria (20T7; quoted, in his turn, by Eusebius (20T8)): "It was the time when birds and creatures of the sea and four-footed animals could talk in the same way as the Promethean clay"[5]. A lacuna of at most seventeen verses in the papyrus[6] (between

---

[1] Puelma Piwonka 1949, 222: "àtiologisches Màrchen".

[2] Hausrath's judgment (1949, 50-53) is too negative; cf. Corbato 1979, 46.

[3] Translations from Call. 20F1 and from the *Diegeseis* (20T9-10) are by Trypanis 1958, 112-118.

[4] Hausrath's full reconstruction (1949) is gratuitous; cf. Pfeiffer's *addendum* (II 117).

[5] Cf. the *incipit* of Philo's fable: λέγεται γάρ, ὡς ἄρα πάνθ' ὅσα ζῷα χερσαῖα καὶ ἔνυδρα καὶ πτηνὰ τὸ παλαιὸν ὁμόφωνα ἦν, καὶ ὅνπερ τρόπον ἀνθρώπων Ἕλληνες μὲν Ἕλλησι, βαρβάροις δὲ βάρβαροι νῦν οἱ ὁμόγλωττοι διαλέγονται.

[6] 17 = 20 (between the last verse of the first *Iamb* and the first of the second)—3 (the *incipit* of the second *Iamb*); Pfeiffer *ad* fr. 191 *sub fine*, fr. 192.3. Adrados (1987a, 294), reporting that Callimachus' fable is 16 lines long, appears to forget the existence of the lacuna.

vv. 3 and 4) probably contained a description of the swan's embassy[7] on behalf of the other animals to Zeus, for 4 "in the time of Cronus, and even before"[8] may well constitute the end of the fox's speech, as the assumption that λ..ουσα (5) is a feminine participle (possibly of a *verbum dicendi*) going with the fox, seems plausible[9]. A comparison with Philo's fable makes it clear *what* message the swan reported to Zeus on behalf of the animals: they requested to be freed from old age (γῆρας), like the snake, who could shed off his skin (γῆρας), which they considered to be unjust[10]. Philo's and (in all probability) Callimachus' fables thus appear to be based upon the same homonymy as Nicander's (3F1). In 6-10 Zeus' reaction to the swan's shameless request[11] is described: "he deprived the animals of their speech, and... (diverted) it to the race of men". Here Callimachus inserts two authorial statements. The first is an evaluative remark, whose latter part may allude to the animals' condemnation of Zeus' distribution of γῆρας: "Just is Zeus, yet unjust was his ruling" (6); the second authorial insertion is an ironical parenthesis expressing the typically Callimachean idea that mankind already *was* loquacious enough, so as not to need to be granted the animals' power of speech: "as though we were not in a position to give part of our voice to others" (8-9). The final aetiology serves as an epimythium: "And for this cause, Andronicus, all men have become loquacious and wordy."

[7] Corbato (1979, 51), comparing *fab. aes.* 174 and 175 (not 173) Chambry (247 Hausrath, Aphth. 2; *Aes.* 233, 399), suggests that the swan has been selected to play this part because of his melodious qualities.

[8] Corbato (1979, 53-54), conjecturing πρὸ τ[ῆς Γαίης and comparing Ar. 17A6, suggests that the fox is so bold as to point out here the animals' primordiality (like Aesop's Lark in *Birds*).

[9] Καψωμενος 1937, 29, suppleting (but somewhat overconfidently omitting some brackets) λέγουσα καὶ κῶς [ο]ὐ σ[υ]νῆμεν αἰσχ[ύνῃ; cf. Pfeiffer *ad loc.*; Trypanis lc.

[10] Ph. *Conf. Ling.* 7 ...περὶ ἀθανασίας ἐπρεσβεύετο γήρως ἔκλυσιν καὶ τὴν εἰς ἀεὶ νεότητος ἀκμὴν αἰτούμενα, φάσκοντα καὶ τῶν παρ' αὐτοῖς ἓν ἤδη ζῴων τὸ ἑρπετον, ὄφιν, τετυχηκέναι ταύτης τῆς δωρεᾶς· ἀποδυόμενον γὰρ τὸ γῆρας πάλιν ἐξ ὑπαρχῆς ἀνηβᾶν· ἄτοπον δ' εἶναι ἢ τὰ κρείττω τοῦ χείρονος ἢ ἑνὸς τὰ πάντα λειφθῆναι. Früchtel (1950, 123) was the first to draw attention to the parallel, but did not recognize that the text of the *Diegesis* made perfect sense (cf. the editorial note (ib. 123-124) and Früchtel's postscriptum (ib. 124)). Früchtel rightly opposes Hausrath (1949, 52), who, referring to Maas, considers γήρως to be "korrupt" (cf. Barber, E.A., "Notes on the *Diegeseis* of Callimachus (Pap. Mil. 18)", *CQ* 33, 1939, 67, who conjectured γηρῶ(ντο)ς), and, apparently (mis)led by Bolte's conjecture γήρυος, literally (ib. 57) fills the lacuna with a singing contest between the swan and the fox!

[11] Not "para compensar su debilidad [*sc.* de los hombres]" (contra Adrados 1987a, 294).

In many respects the fable is comparable with other fables.[12] First, the fable[13] is typically ascribed to Aesop, who is presented as its narrator (15). However, Callimachus' ascription of the fable to Aesop is *atypical* (and, therefore, in a way, typically Callimachean[14]) as regards its place and the legendary fabulist's origin: Aesop is said to be "of Sardis" (16), and the ascription is placed *after*[15] the fable has been told; likewise, the addressee, Andronicus, is mentioned only *after* the fable.[16] Secondly, it is implicitly called a fable (17 μῦθον). Thirdly, its *incipit* is typically fabulistic.[17] The same goes for its theme.[18] Furthermore, the mention of Prometheus and the occurrence of Zeus (cf. Nic. 3F1)[19], as well as the last word of the epimythium proper (ἐκεῖθεν)[20] are typical of aetiological fables. Finally, Callimachus' (again like Nicander's) fable makes an elaborate use of the device called *kenning*: the fish are circumscribed by "those in the sea" (2 τοὺν θαλάσσῃ) and by "those inhabiting the sea" (12 τῶν θαλάσσαν οἰ[κεύντων[21]); the animals by "the four-footed" (2 τὸ τετράπουν); man by "the Promethean clay" (3 ὁ πηλὸς ὁ Προμήθειος)[22]. To these *kenningar* one might add the indication of the birds by 1 τὸ πτηνόν (lit.

[12] However, Corbato's connection (1979, 60) of the fable's *incipit* and metre with Hes. 2F1 and Archil. 4F2, respectively, is unconvincing.

[13] Once thought to be by Babrius (Tyrwhitt 1810, p. CLXI; Fix, Th., review of Boissonade 1844, *RPh* 1, 1845, 52; contra: Crusius(-Muller) 1897, 208-210; cf. Marenghi 1955b, 128).

[14] Cf., e.g., Hutchinson (1988, 71) and Bulloch (1989, 21), on the innovative character of Callimachus' poetry and the poet's play with literary conventions, respectively.

[15] Therefore, Ferguson's statement (1980, 63) that the iamb "takes off from Aesop" is infelicitous.

[16] Of course, prudence is called for in view of the lacuna between 3 and 4, where Aesop and/or Andronicus might have been mentioned before.

[17] Karadagli 1981, 99-100.

[18] The closest parallel, besides Philo's fable referred to above, is *fab. aes.* 228 Hausrath (*Aes.* 240); cf. Trypanis 1958, 112; Corbato 1979, 51; Adrados 1987a, 295.

[19] See above, Nic. 3F1, n. 102; cf. Corbato 1979, 51-52.

[20] Cf. e.g. *Dieg.* 20T9.27 ἔκτοτε.

[21] Cf. Courtney 1989. Platt (A., "Callimachus *Iambi* 162-170", *CQ* 4, 1910, 205; cf. Clayman 1980, 19) thinks this to hint at sea-gulls (contra: Καψωμενος 1937, 32-33; Hausrath 1949, 55; Puelma Piwonka 1949, 224, n. 2; Bing 1981, 33-34), Immisch (1930, 161 (followed by Karadagli 1981, 150, n. 1); contra: Bing 1981, 34) at the shell-fish, Hausrath (ibid.) at κήτεα, Puelma Piwonka (1949, 224) at mussels.

[22] Trypanis' translation (1958, 113-115) somewhat spoils the effect by solving three of the five riddles. As for the last *kenning*—"di rimembranza eschilea [fr. 359 N. (?)]...o nettamente aristofanesca [*Av.* 686]" (Corbato 1979, 60)—, cf. fr. 493 Pfeiffer *ap.* Clem. Al. (20T7; quoted by Eus. (20T8)).

"the winged") and of the animals[23] by 7 τῶν ἑρπετῶν (lit. "the creepers"), although these are traditional metaphors (see LSJ svv).

The function of the fable is twofold: aetiological and satirical.[24] The fable is an aetiology of man's loquaciousness. In itself, the very idea of deriving human speech from beasts is obviously satirical. Callimachus yet acuminates this general satire to literary critique *ad hominem* by adding four exemplifications[25], which correspond to the tripartition of the fauna in lines 1-2[26]: "Eudemos, therefore, has a dog's voice, and Philton a donkey's, (the orators) that of a parrot, and the tragedians have a voice like the dwellers in the sea." Eudemos and Philton are probably pseudonyms[27] for two literary rivals of Callimachus'; for whom exactly, however, is unclear.[28] Anyway, whoever may be hidden behind these pen names, Callimachus' qualifications of Eudemos' and Philton's voice, and, by implication, of their literary production, as canine and asinine, respectively, obviously amount to scornful disqualifications.[29] Besides, one might speculate that Eudemus was a Cynic. It is noteworthy that both proper names contain semantically positive elements (εὐ-, φιλ-; cf. *Aet.* 1, fr. 1.30 Pfeiffer ἐφίλησαν (see below, n. 54)), which may be interpreted as an ironical hint by Callimachus at the popularity (cf. -δημος) of these poetasters at the time. Comparably, the addressee's name—possibly an alias[30], too—seems to be a telling compound, ironically hinting at man's (ἀνδρο-; cf. 10 ἀνδρῶν) victory (-νικος): man won, and the animals lost, the power of speech. In the lacuna in verse 11 Callimachus

[23] Not "Schlangen und Gewürm" (Wilamowitz; contra: Hausrath 1949, 54).

[24] Contra Buhler 1964, 230.

[25] These belong (at least partly) to the context, rather than to the fable proper (contra Buhler 1964, 234-235). Corbato (1979, 60) finds a connection between "l'impostazione scoptica" and "l'aggancio ipponatteo nel verso" (see below).

[26] Hausrath 1949, 55.

[27] Less correctly Gallavotti 1946, 18: "tale e...tal altro apertamente nominati".

[28] Trypanis (1958, 113, n. b), referring to Coppola, observes that pointing to the Eudemos in Call. *Epigr.* 47 Pfeiffer (*AP* 6.301; 1-3 quoted by *Suda*, ε 2082 Adler) gets nowhere.

[29] Cf. (for the dog) Lilja 1976, 99. Corbato's ἀπορία (1979, 55) is overcautious. As for the ass, Bing (1988, 123, n. 49) compares Hera's braying to Zeus' mistresses (ἐπεβρωμᾶτο, for which see Mineur, W.H., *Callimachus. Hymn to Delus*, Leiden: Brill 1984, 96; Lanzara, V.G., *Callimaco. Inno a Delo*, Pisa: Giardini 1990, 85) as part of the unfavourable portrait of the "supporters of the old order".

[30] Probably not, however, "a mere alias for Callimachus", as suggested by Knox 1926, 248.

possibly called yet another rival by name.[31] Whoever may have been hinted at here, Callimachus does not sing the praises of his (possibly: their) literary originality, for a parrot cannot but parrot.[32] Callimachus' fourth, marine exemplification is directed against tragedians[33], who are possibly hereby (dis)qualified as being deprived of any literary talent.[34]

To the aetiological epimythium Callimachus adds an epilogue[35] (15-17), which is quoted by Apollonius (20T3): "Aesop of Sardis told this, whom the Delphians did not receive well when he recited his tale." This epilogue converts the second *Iamb* into a second-degree narrative: Callimachus has Aesop tell a fable. On the first level, the fable fits its alleged context well: Aesop performed his swan song to the Delphians, who silenced him (like Zeus the animals)[36]; the suggestion that ᾄδοντα (17) might be ambiguous does not seem too far-

[31] Cf. Hausrath (1949, 55, gratuitously conjecturing, however, "des schönklingenden Namens wegen Χαιρήμων"), Pfeiffer's addendum (II 117), Fraser (1972, II 1043), Bing (1981, 34); Courtney (1989; cf. Clayman 1980, 18). Some scholars (like Buhler 1964, 234), however, think that Callimachus rather referred to some other *group*. Arnim (followed by Norsa-Vitelli; Trypanis 1958, 115; Van Rooijen-Dijkman 1984, 13) conjectured ῥητῆρες; cf. Immisch 1930, 161, n. 1: "Demagogen (?)"; Καψωμενος 1937, 32; Puelma Piwonka 1949, 224, n. 1; Dawson 1950, 30; Clayman 1980, 19; contra: Corbato 1979, 55. Capovilla (1967, II 59) and Ferguson (1980, 63) seem to forget that this is only a conjecture. Both of the arguments adduced by Trypanis (lc)—one general: "the *Diegesis* does not mention any other name", one specific: "oratory, like dramatic poetry, was in decline in the days of Callimachus"—need not be conclusive. Conversely, the singular ψιττακοῦ (Hausrath lc) seems to point to an *individual* (Callimachus could have written ψιττακῶν). Korte (A.-Handel, P., *Die hellenistische Dichtung*, Stuttgart: Kroner 1960², 100) misleadingly suggests that Philton has the voice of both the ass and the parrot.

[32] Corbato's reference (1979, 55) to the parrot's τερπνὸν κράζειν in *fab. aes.* 356 (not 355) Chambry (261 Hausrath; *Aes.* 244) is off the mark.

[33] Tragic poets, not actors (Καψωμενος 1937, 34 contra Von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff 1924, I 211, n. 1).

[34] Cf. Bing (1981, 35), referring to Emped. 31B74 Diels-Kranz *ap.* Plu. *Mor.* 685F: "tantamount to calling them ἄμουσος". However, other *tertia comparationis* have been argued for. Von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff (lc; Hausrath 1949, 55): "weil diese...die lautesten Stimmen brauchten". Καψωμενος (1937, 34-35; cf. Corbato 1979, 59), referring to Plu. *Mor.* 975B, ἀμάθειαν καὶ ἀνοησίαν (contra: Herter, H., review of Pfeiffer, *Gnomon* 26, 1954, 79, referring to Kranz: "der Mund der Schauspielermaske [konnte] an ein Fischmaul erinnert haben"); Dawson (1950, 30), adducing Apostol. 13.45 (Arsen. 41.79): "without a voice" (but see Babr. G19a.10 πλωτὸς ἰχθὺς συνελάλει φίλῳ ναύτῃ). Courtney (1989), referring to Fest. (p. 132 M): "inaudible".

[35] A sign in the papyrus marks the end of the *Iamb*; Pfeiffer *ad loc.* Capovilla 1967, II 276: "σφραγίς".

[36] Cf. Corbato's analysis (1979, 60-61).

fetched in view of the parallel in the fourth *Iamb* (20F2.47-48) κύκνος [ὡς... | ᾔεισας. To call the epilogue an understatement[37] would be an understatement, in view of the widespread ancient tradition on Aesop's violent death in Delphi.[38] On the second level, the epilogue is an *over*statement, for, unlike Aesop, whom he compares himself to, Callimachus will probably not have to face an execution (nor speechlessness) because of his fable-telling.[39] Rather, the epilogue serves as Callimachus' ironical prophecy about, or anticipation of, his audience's—*in casu* the derided rival poets'—probable reaction to the fable.[40] If the above analysis of the pseudonyms is not off the mark, the negative reaction to be experienced by the fabulist is in sharp contrast with his rivals' popularity. But this does not seem to be Callimachus' final word: by comparing himself to the fabulist from Sardis[41] Callimachus might be taken to condemn implicitly, and ingeniously, the expected negative reaction of his audience as unjust, and, at the same time, to warn them that they will regret it, for they will have remembered the equally widespread tradition[42] that the Delphians had to atone for Aesop's unjust death.

In various ways, the fable in the second *Iamb* is connected also with its context in a broader sense: Callimachus' book of *Iambs* as a whole and, at a yet higher level, the *Aetia*, to which Callimachus, innovatively transgressing literary genres, probably meant the *Iambs* as a sequel.[43] The second *Iamb* is closely connected with the first not only

[37] Clayman 1980, 17; cf. Capovilla 1967, II 277: "espressione finemente eufemistica".

[38] See above, Ar. 17F5, n. 61.

[39] Hutchinson 1988, 53; cf. Bühler 1964, 235. Somewhat differently Puelma Piwonka 1949, 212-213 (not noting the irony or the implications of the poet's reference to Aesop).

[40] Hausrath's interpretation (1949, 55; likewise Bühler 1964, 234-235) is less satisfactory: "Abschließend schiebt Kallimachos scherzhaft die Verantwortung für die Schmähung seiner lieber Zeitgenossen dem alten Äsop zu".

[41] It might be remarked here that the statement of the *Diegesis* ἴσως δὲ καὶ Σαρδιανὸν εἶπε τὸν Αἴσωπον seems just a marginal lexicographical note on Σαρδιηνὸς (thus Hausrath 1949, 56 contra Norsa-Vitelli; Pfeiffer's addenda I 504 (Maas), II 117; cf. Puelma Piwonka 1949, 227, n. 1), and not, *pace* Dawson (1950, 27, but see 30) and Fraser (1972, I 741), a mockery, nor, *pace* Καψωμενος (1937, 36) and Corbato (1979, 61), an indication that Callimachus uses Aesop's origin as an allusion to the proverb Σαρδιανὸς κάπηλος (Macar. 7.56; cf. Zen. 5.1, Diogenian. 6.3, Apostol. 10.83 (Arsen. 34.13): Λυδὸς καπηλεύει), as ἴσως means "perhaps", not "likewise".

[42] See again above, Ar. 17F5, n. 61.

[43] See Puelma 1957, 246-247, 262 n. 1 and 1995, 216; Capovilla 1967, II 376-377; Fraser 1972, I 720, 733-734, II 1006-1007 nn. 11-12; Corbato 1979, 61-62; Knox, P.E., "The Epilogue to the *Aetia*", *GRBS* 26, 1985, 59-65; Clayman 1988,

formally, by its (choliambic) metre and (Ionic) dialect (like *Iambs* 3-4 and 13[44]), but also, and more importantly, in that both contain a second-degree story about a literary subject put into the mouth of an Ionian narrator (Hipponax[45] of Ephesus and Aesop of Sardis), who were allegedly killed in a similar (perhaps even identical[46]) way. The arrangement might be called chiastic: in the first *Iamb* it is clear from the very start[47] that Callimachus dons Hipponax, whereas in the second *Iamb* it is only in the epilogue that Callimachus reveals that Aesop was the narrator. This opposite composition corresponds to the opposite contents of the stories inserted: Hipponax's story (for which see the Appendix below) is an implicit, if ironical[48], plea for a modest acknowledgement of the talents of colleagues, whereas by Aesop's fable Callimachus explicitly scorns his rivals as untalented. Furthermore, and more particularly, both *Iambs* refer to a dog's linguistic peculiarities as a satirical metaphor[49], and both critically mention the Delphians[50]. The connection between the second and fourth *Iambs* will be discussed below (20F2).

The fable occupying the second *Iamb* is also connected with the (possibly) preceding book of *Aetia*. First of all, the fable is an *aetiology* (like *Iambs* 7-11[51]). More particularly, both the braying of an ass[52],

---

listing (278, n. 3) adherents and opponents of this interpretation on the strength of fr. 112.9 Pfeiffer (compare the latter *ad loc.* and II, pp. XXXVIsq); contra: Pohlenz, M., "Kallimachos' Aitia", *Hermes* 68, 1933, 325-326.

[44] Gallavotti 1946, 14-17, 20; cf. Buhler 1964, 227.

[45] The metre's εὑρετής; see *Iamb.* 13 (fr. 203).13-14 with Pfeiffer *ad loc.*, Herod. 8.78-79, Heph. 5 (p. 17 Consbruch).

[46] Both Hipponax (fr. 37 West *ap.* Choerob. *in* Heph. (p. 195 Consbruch)) and Aesop (e.g. Σ *ad Iamb.* 1.27; for further references, see above, Ar. 17F5, n. 61) are said to have been stoned; Clayman 1980, 17.

[47] 1 Ἀκούσαθ' Ἱππώνακτος·...

[48] Clayman 1980, 14.

[49] *Iamb.* 1.83 τὴν γλῶσσαν †ελων ὡς κύων ὅταν πίνῃ ~ *Iamb.* 2.10.

[50] *Iamb.* 1(fr. 191 Pfeiffer).27 ἀπὸ θύματος Δελφ[οί ~ *Iamb.* 2.16-17. Σ Flor. *ad Iamb.* 1 lc (p. 165 Pfeiffer; *Aes.* T 26) tells the story of Aesop's violent death in Delphi, to which Callimachus alludes in *Iamb.* 2 lc; cf. Puelma Piwonka 1949, 212-213. This is not to say that, as Puelma Piwonka (lc; cf. Capovilla 1967, II 276) seems to assume, *Iamb.* 1 lc alludes to Aesop's *fables*, too (cf. Ardizzoni 1980, 149-150; Ferguson 1980, 61; Bergson, L., "Kallimachos, Iambos I (Fr. 191 Pf.), 26-28", *Eranos* 84, 1986, 13).

[51] Gallavotti 1946, 19; Fraser 1972, I 736-738; Clayman 1988, 283-284, none, however, mentioning the aetiological fable in this connection; cf., however, Corbato 1979, 62-63, and the Appendix below.

[52] Cf. Clayman 1980, 19.

appreciated by some but despised by Callimachus[53], and the ability of shedding off one's slough, *casu quo* old age[54], which Callimachus and the animals, respectively, yearn for but do not have, occur in the prologue of the first book of the *Aetia*, too. Finally, the fable in the second *Iamb* is a literary polemic, which is an important theme of both the *Aetia* and the *Iambs*.

20F2 Call. *Iamb.* 4(fr. 194 Pfeiffer).6sqq: Laurel, Olive and Bramble (*Aes.* 439)

Callimachus' second fable occurs in the same work (the *Iambs*[55]), (choliambic) metre and (Ionian) dialect as the one discussed above (20F1). The first line of the fable proper (6-8) reads:

"The Lydians of old say that once on Tmolos a quarrel arose between the Laurel and the Olive..."[56]

The *Diegesis* (20T10.9) adds in a parenthesis that the trees "grew side by side", but it is unclear whether Callimachus gave this local explanation of their polemics, too. For after the *incipit* of the fable the state of the papyri (*POxy.* 1011 combined with 2215) is lacunal. Probably the laurel threw the gauntlet[57], whereupon the olive retorted by ironically disparaging herself[58] and (possibly) referring to her origin (16)[59]. After these preliminary skirmishes the laurel expatiates on her

---

[53] *Aet.* 1, fr. 1.30-32 Pfeiffer ...θ]όρυβον δ' οὐκ ἐφίλησαν ὄνων. | θηρὶ μὲν ο]ὐατόεντι πανείκελον ὀγκήσαιτο | ἄλλος,... (Callimachus sings for those who do *not* like the braying of asses, which implies that others do; from Σ *ad* ib. 43 (p. 7 Pfeiffer: ὄνους) it can be deduced that asses were mentioned in the prologue once again) ~ *Iamb.* 2.11 ὄνου δὲ Φίλτων.

[54] *Aet.* 1, fr. 1.33-35 Pfeiffer γῆρας...|...|...ἐκδύοιμι (Pfeiffer *ad loc.*: "term. techn. et de serpentibus et de insectis") ~ *Dieg.* 6.24 κατὰ λύσιν γήρως; Ph. *Conf. Ling.* 7 γήρως ἔκλυσιν, ὄφιν, ἀποδυόμενον γὰρ τὸ γῆρας πάλιν ἐξ ὑπαρχῆς ἀνηβᾶν (cf. Pfeiffer's addendum I 117 (in general): "Philonem e carminibus (et paraphrasi?) Callimachi hausisse constat"); cf. Puelma Piwonka 1949, 227, n. 1.

[55] Not "in seinen *Aitia*" (contra Josifović 1961, 93).

[56] Translations from Call. 20F2 are by Fraser 1972, I 742-743.

[57] Cf. Puelma Piwonka 1949, 237; Dawson 1950, 43; Pfeiffer *ad* fr. 194.11: "provocare videtur laurus olivam ad certamen"; Barigazzi's "certamente" (1980, 243) seems overconfident in view of the tradition of the text. Fraser (1972, I 742), on the other hand, assumes that the olive is the first to speak. In Mesopotamian debate poems "the rule was to let the eventual winner begin" (Vanstiphout 1990, 298).

[58] 13 †ἐγὼ φαύλη πάντων τῶν δένδρων εἰμί† *ap.* Tryphon. (20T1 = 61A1): ἀστεϊζομένη ἡ ἐλαία φησίν; 15 τ̣άλαινα (Pfeiffer *ad loc.*: "oliva de se ipsa"; Barigazzi 1980, 243-244; however, theoretically it remains possible that the laurel is meant).

[59] Barigazzi (1980, 243-244), pointing to 20 ὁ̣ Δῆλον ο[ἰκέων, tentatively suppletes ἐμεῦ πα[τὴρ θεά τις, οὐ θεὸς δῆθεν.

qualities (18-43), to which the olive reacts even more elaborately (46-92). Both of these pleas are fairly well preserved but for the opening lines of the laurel's speech and the closing lines of the olive's:

"...and the left side is white like the belly of a water snake, and the other, mostly bare, has caught the sun. And what house is there by whose threshold I do not stand? What prophet or sacrificer does not carry me with him; yea, and Pythia sits on the laurel, and chants of (?) the laurel[60], and laurel forms her couch. Oh foolish Olive! did not Branchos make whole again the sons of the Ionians with whom Phoibos was angered, striking them with the laurel and speaking his obscure (?) utterances to the people twice or thrice? And I frequent feasts and the Pythian dance, and I am the prize of victory; and the Dorians cut me on the high mountains of Tempe and bring me to Delphi, whenever the sacred rites of Apollo are accomplished. Oh foolish Olive! I know no sorrow, nor do I know the way the bier-carrier takes, for I am pure, and men do not tread on me, for I am sacred. But with you, whenever men are about to burn a corpse or enfold it in a grave, they wreathe themselves, and lay you beneath the flanks of him who breathes no more.'

So much she spake, but nothing more. But the tree that yields the oil disposed of her quite calmly:

'Oh fair in all respects, you sang my finest point (?) at the end, like Apollo's swan. May I never tire <of doing so ?>. For I escort those whom Ares <destroys ?>...and I, when his children carry to the grave some white-haired Tethys or old Tithonus, go with them, and lie upon the ground. I rejoice in this more than you in those who bear you from Tempe. But since you have mentioned this too, am I not better as a prize than you? For the games at Olympia are greater than those at Delphi. But silence is the best of all. Therefore I utter no word of praise or blame of you. But two birds have long been perched among my leaves and twitter these things—a chattering pair they are.

'A. Who devised the Laurel? B. Earth and—, just like the ilex, the oak, the cypress, and the pine. A. And who devised the olive? B. Pallas, when she strove with the Seaweed-Dweller in old times for the Akte, and a man with a snake tail acted as judge. A. One fall against the Laurel! And of the immortals who honours the olive, and who the

---

[60] δάφνην δ' ἀείδει; Kambylis (1965, 19) prefers to translate: "sie prohezeit singend, bzw. singt divinatorisch".

laurel? B. Apollo the laurel, and Pallas that which she herself discovered. A. This is a tie; between gods I do not judge. B. What is the Laurel's fruit? For what purpose may I use it? A. Do not eat it, nor drink it, nor use it for ointment. But the fruit of the olive is first the food (of birds ?), which they call 'olive-cake', second oil, and third the pickled olive food which even Theseus drank. B. A second fall against the Laurel. A. Whose leaf do suppliants offer? B. That of the olive. A. The Laurel has had his third fall.'

(The Olive speaks)—Oh dear, how they chatter ceaselessly on. Impudent crow, are your lips sore?—[61]

'B. Whose tree-trunk do the Delians preserve? A. That of the olive by which Leto found rest."' (22-84)

At this point the papyrus is again lacunal. Reference seems to be made, perhaps by the birds[62], to a laurel wreath (86 ἔστεφεν...ἡ δάφνη), and the olive is connected with victory (87 καλλίνικος ἡλαίη). At any rate, it is clear that the olive ended her speech by harking back to the arguments proposed by the laurel at the beginning of her speech, concerning the "prophets" and the "threshold" (compare 24 φλιῇ and 25 μάντις with 90 μάντεις and 91 φλιῆς). The subsequent lines—and the diegete's summary (20T10.11-17)—show that the trees prepare for another round but are interrupted by an outsider, whom the laurel cuts down to his size:

"Thus she spake, and the heart of the Laurel was pained at her words, and she stirred herself a second time, more than before, to the battle, until a bramble-bush...not far from the trees spoke out: 'Oh wretched trees! cannot we stop quarrelling, for else we shall become a cause of rejoicing to our foes[63]; nor let us rashly say such unhallowed things to one another...' Then the Laurel looked at her grimly like a bull, and said: 'You miserable disgrace, are you, then, one of

[61] 81-82 is a typically Callimachean (cf. Ardizzoni 1980, 151) interruption by the olive of the birds' dialogue *entre parenthèses* (Pfeiffer *ad loc.*; Dawson 1950, 49 (with different numeration); Trypanis 1958, 124-125; Fraser 1972, I 743), not its conclusion (contra Clayman 1980, 23), for 83-84 are spoken by the birds, not the olive, as may be clear from comparing the catechetical structure of 79-80: τεῦ γὰρ τὸ...; τὸ τῆς ἐλαίης.

[62] Pfeiffer (*ad* fr. 194.46-92, with due caution) may be right in supposing that the birds' discussion ended only in 87. Fraser (1972, I 743), however, assumes that the olive restarts to speak on her own account already at 85, Clayman (1980, 25) even at 83 (but see previous note).

[63] 99 ἐχθροῖς (cf. *Dieg.* 7.13 ⟨τοῖ⟩ς δυσ[μ]ενέσι). Karadagli (1981, 41) incorrectly translates "Kinder".

us? May Zeus not inflict that on me! Your very proximity stifles me... No, by Phoibos, by the Mistress for whom the cymbals clash, No by Paktolos...'" (93-106)

Here, probably at or near the end of the fable[64], the principal papyrus (*POxy.* 1011) breaks off. The most striking feature of the above fable is its length (more than a hundred verses[65]), which is anomalous, if not unique[66], in fables. Callimachus' fable is the oldest plant, or rather: tree, fable extant in Greek literature. As a matter of fact, its *incipit* (6-8) is often quoted—by paroemiographers (Luc. Tarrh., Ps.-Diogenian., Apostol.), grammarians (Herenn. Ph., Choer.), lexicographers (*Et. Gud.*, Ps.-Ammon.), and scholiasts (Eust. (*bis*), Σ *in Il.*) (20T2 = G21; 20T4-5 = G27-28; 20T11-16)—as an example of this particular subspecies (ἀπὸ φυτῶν). Besides the three protagonists (laurel, olive, bramble), the olive mentions five[67] other trees—*Rubus ulmifolius* (65 πρῖνον), *Quercus ilex* (δρῦν), *Cyperus longus* (κύπειρον), *Pinus Laricio* (πεύκην), *Pirus communis* (88 τὴν ὄγχνην)—, which emphasizes the arboreal character of the fable. The fable is clearly demarcated from its context by terminology (6 τὸν αἶνον (object of ἄκο⌊υ⌋ε)). The *incipit* of the fable is normal and somewhat anomalous at the same time in that it contains both the typically story-telling[68] indefinite introductory time adjunct (6 κοτε; cf. 7, 63 πάλαι) and an atypical[69] place adjunct (6 ἐ⌊ν...Τμώλῳ); it is true that

[64] Pfeiffer (*ad* fr. 194.107), tentatively connecting (*ad Dieg.* 7.17) the diegete's δρα[(20T10.18) with Callimachus' δρήστης (107), may be right in assuming that the remainder of the text, preserved in two fragmentary papyri (*PSI* 1216 and *PRyl.* 485), belongs to the context, not to the fable. For Barigazzi's certainty (1980, 247), see above, n. 57. Dawson (1950, 51), on the other hand, suggests to interpret these remaining lines as a continuation of the fable.

[65] The fable proper begins in 6 and runs at least on to 106. The situation has dramatically changed since Dareste (1846, 86), who knew "que trois vers"! Although caution is needed in view of the incomplete state of *Iambs* 8-11 (frr. 198-201 Pfeiffer), the two *Iambs* (2 and 4) which contain fables attract attention on account of their brevity and length, respectively; cf. Gallavotti 1946, 14, 18.

[66] See Knauth (above, Chapter I.I, 2.13, with n. 184 for other examples; cf. the Synthesis).

[67] Knox's conjecture (1926, 254) in line 11 adds a sixth one: ἡ φη[γός (*Quercus Aegilops*). All Latin names according to LSJ svv. Buhler (1964, 245), commenting upon 65, observes that "jedes neue Ergewachs lässt den Wert des Lorbeers um eine Stufe sinken".

[68] Contra Hausrath-Marx 1922, p. XII: "Jeder Hauch volkstumlicher Poesie ist freilich in dieser Gelehrtendichtung...vollig geschwunden."

[69] See above, Chapter I.I, 2.3 (Doderer), 2.8 (Lindner); cf. the Synthesis above.

Callimachus' fourth *Iamb* was certainly not the first[70] to contain such a specification of the locality, but it is the oldest, and perhaps the only[71], fable extant which abounds in nouns indicating a particular locality.[72] The location of the fable in Asia Minor (7 οἱ...Λύδοι) might point to a Near Eastern origin[73]; the Babylonian dispute between Tamarisk and Palm dating from the second millennium before the Christian era is a striking parallel, indeed[74]. Besides, the Lydian setting serves to demarcate the fable from its context by the device of ring composition: the local adjunct "on Mount Tmolus" are the very first words of the fable proper (6 ἐ˪ν...Τμώλῳ[75]); (presumably) near the end[76] the laurel swears by the Pactolus, a river which springs at this very mountain (106 Πακτω[λόν). In addition, a combination of the place adjuncts of the two choliambic fables (20F1-2) suggests that the marked Lydian *couleur locale* of the fourth *Iamb* is a subtle (typically Callimachean) reference to Aesop (see above, Chapter I.III, 5.6), the fabulist *par excellence*, who in the second *Iamb* was said to be "of Sar-

---

[70] Cf. already Semon. 9F1.1 ἔγχελυν Μαιανδρίην; Timocr. 10T2 (Ps.-Diogenian.) ἐν Κύπρῳ, οἱ Κύπριοι; Ar. 17F3.1427 ἀνὴρ Συβαρίτης, 17F4.1435 ἐν Συβάρει and 1438 Συβαρῖτις.

[71] The only, rather late, parallel which I have been able to find is the accumulation of place adjuncts in the *incipit* of Franco de Amelia 6 (Finch 1978, 65; *Aes.* 721): *Ex oppido Asnelonge partium Etruriae tenus Paludes quas Chianas vulgus appellat...ad beatam Virginem de Loreto duo milia a Racenato provinciae Marchiae distantem...*

[72] Cf. 7 οἱ...Λυδοί (outside the fable proper), 20: Δῆλον, cf. 26 Πυθίη, 29: τῶν Ἰώνων, cf. 33 τὸν Πυθαϊστήν, 34: οἱ Δωριῆς, ibid. Τεμπόθεν, 35: ἐς Δελφούς, 56: ἐκ τῶν...Τεμπέων, 58: οὐν Ὀλυμπίῃ μέζων, 59: 'ν τοῖσι Δελφοῖς, 68: τῆς Ἀκτῆς, 83: Δήλιοι, 106: οὐ μὰ Πακτ[ωλόν. This might be considered to be typical of Callimachus, although the characterization of his poetry as "Gelehrtendichtung" (cf. Hausrath-Marx 1922, p. XII (quoted above, n. 68); Korte-Handel 1965, 12) is an oversimplification (see Hutchinson 1988, 26-31), and Bulloch (1989, 10) cautions that he has more than "simply a taste for...arcane antiquarianism on points of geography".

[73] Cf. Fraser 1972, I 743-744.

[74] See Immisch 1892; Diels 1910; Bolte-Polívka 1912-1932, IV 122; Ebeling 1927, 3-4 (discussed by Port, W., "Die Literatur zur griechischen und romischen Fabel in den Jahren 1925-1931/32", *BuJB* 240, 1933, III, 64-65; contra: Pugliarello 1973, 26); Lambert, W.G., *Babylonian Wisdom Literature*, Oxford: Clarendon P 1960, 151-164; La Penna 1961, 474; West (M.) 1969, 119. Nøjgaard (1964, 440-441; contra: Fraser 1972, II 1046-1047) draws attention to some differences; Adrados (1979a, 377), referring to Sicherl 1978, compares the Egyptian fable "del sicómoro y el árbol moringa", too.

[75] Not in Eustathius' *variae lectiones*: 20T13 Πύλῳ, 20T14 μάλῳ ἢ Δάλῳ τούτεστι Δήλῳ τῇ νήσῳ.

[76] Pfeiffer *ad* 107: "non iam ad αἶνον pertinere videntur, sed ad 'epilogum'?" *ad* 107-17: "non constat, quot versus inter 106 et 107 desint".

dis", as the capital of Lydia is on the Pactolus and under Mount Tmolus! Finally, the occurrence of the bramble as *survenant* in general, and the motivation of his presence by a place adjunct (*in parenthesi*: 97 ἦν γὰρ οὐκ ἄπωθε τῶν δενδρέων; cf. *Dieg.* 7.16 π[αρ]επεφύκ[ει δ' αὐ]ταῖς) in particular, are typical of fables.[77] Like Callimachus' other choliambic fable (20F1), but at an even larger scale, the fable under discussion contains a number of (descriptive) *kenningar*: "the inhabitant of Delus" (20 ὁ Δῆλον ο[ἰκέων) is a circumlocution for Apollo; "the tree that yields the oil" (45 ἡ τεκοῦσα τὸ χρῖμ[α) for the olive; "the Seaweed-Dweller" (67 τῷ φυκιοίκῳ) for Poseidon; "a man with a snake tail" (68 ἀνὴρ ὄφις τὰ νέρθεν) for Cecrops; "*the immortals*" (69 τῶν...ἀειζώων) for the gods; and "the Mistress for whom the cymbals clash" (105-106 δέσποιναν | τῇ κ]ύμβαλοι ψοθεῦσιν) for Cybele.[78] If the above interpretation of the fable's Lydian setting is correct, the hidden reference to Aesop might be considered to be the most enigmatic *kenning* of all.

The context (both before and after the fable) has almost completely been lost, but for the *incipit* of the *Iamb*—"You're one of us, son of Charitades, aren't you?", which serves as a lemma in the *Diegesis*. As these opening words are almost identical[79] with the rebuke of the bramble by the laurel (103), one might reasonably deduce that Callimachus' fable about the intervention of the bramble in the dispute between the laurel and the olive metaphorically depicted the intervention of the addressee[80] in some conflict between two rivals.

[77] On the "*introduction spatiale du survenant*", see Nøjgaard (1964, 243-244), who usefully compares *fab aes* 234 and 325 Chambry (170 and 233 Hausrath, *Aes* 161 and 213), but erroneously proclaims Callimachus "le premier auteur connu qui presente une fable avec un survenant", for Aristophanes (17F3 1430 ἐπιστάς) bears away this palm, cf, in general, the Synthesis above

[78] Translations by Fraser 1972, I 742, cf LSJ svv; Trypanis 1958, 125, 127 Howald (1943, 46-47) deems this "harmlose Vertauschung von Appellativen und Eigennamen" typical of "dem behaglichen Erzahlerstil des einfachen Mannes", which is, together with "die Ungeschicktheit der grammatikalischen Fugung, die Wiederholungen und die Schlichtheit des Vokabulars", part of the poet's portrait of the laurel's "Unfeinheit"

[79] Buhler 1964, 233-234 (remarking (ib 246) that the two interruptions after only one word are typical of the poet's "Art, das Geradlinige zu durchbrechen"), Dawson 1950, 53, Fraser 1972, I 743 There is a verbal parallel between the fable and the context *after* the fable, too 99 ἀλλήλας ~ 107 ἀλλήλους—if Pfeiffer is right in ascribing 107-117 to the context, not to the fable.

[80] Puelma Piwonka (1949, 241-242, contra Clayman lc) argues that by the bramble Callimachus metaphorically depicts himself as "Friedensstifter" Capovilla (lc) identifies the bramble with Herodas

This deduction is in accordance with the diegete's summary of the context (2-5), underlining its analogy with the fable by two verbal parallels[81]: "The poet was disputing with one of his rivals, and a certain Simos, who happened to be close by, broke in on their discussion, trying to show himself their equal." Simos was probably[82] Charitades' son, but Simos—"Flat-nose"[83]—may be an alias (like Eudemos and Philton in the second *Iamb* (2OF1)). The conflict in which Callimachus was involved was presumably a literary one. One can only speculate about the identity of his opponent.

Also it is difficult to tell whether Callimachus identified with the laurel[84] or with the olive[85]. At first sight, the former might seem the obvious choice. For it is the laurel who rebukes the bramble (103), like Callimachus' poem rebukes[86] the uninvited intervener (1); moreover, the laurel is a symbol of the *Dichterweihe*[87] and repeatedly refers, like Callimachus elsewhere[88], to the Delphian Apollo, the *Musagetes*[89] (29, 36, 105; cf. 47, 71). But the olive, too, appears to be connected

---

[81] f. 8 διεφέροντο, 11 διαφερομένων (Laurel and Olive) ~ c. 2 Διεφέρετο (Callimachus and rival); f. 11-12 ὑποτυχοῦσα (Bramble) ~ c. 3 παρατυχών (Simos).

[82] Fraser (1972, I 741) apparently (but erroneously) believes that Simos is named in the extant text of Callimachus. A(nother) Simos is mentioned in Call. *Epigr.* 48 Pfeiffer(*AP* 6.310).1; Trypanis 1958, 119, (first) n. a.

[83] LSJ sv; cf. Pfeiffer *ad Dieg.* 7.27.3: "prob. significat τὸν σιμόν".

[84] Diels (1910, col. 998) thinks it probable that by the laurel Callimachus portrays "Alexander Aitolos". Knox (lc; contra: Clayman lc) and Capovilla (lc) suggests that the Apolline laurel stands for Callimachus himself.

[85] Diels 1910, col. 997; Puelma 1972, 91, n. 25; Puelma Piwonka 1949, 238-240; contra: Fraser 1972, II 1046; Clayman 1980, 28. Knox (1926, 253-254; contra: Clayman lc) suggests that the Attic olive represents Herodas. Capovilla (1967, II 58-59) states that the olive represents Posidippus, whereas Krevans (N., "Fighting against Antimachus: The *Lyde* and the *Aetia* Reconsidered", in: Harder, M.A.-Regtuit, R.F.-Wakker, G.C., *Callimachus*, Groningen: Forsten 1993, 160) thinks of Antimachus.

[86] Cf. Bühler 1964, 233-234; Hutchinson 1988, 54.

[87] See Kambylis 1965, 18-23.

[88] Apollo: *Iamb.* 3.1, ib.10; *Iamb.* 12.47, ib.56; *Lyr.*, fr. 227.1 Pf.; *Lyr.*, fr. 228.2 Pf.; *Aet.* 1, fr. 1.22 Pf.; *Aet.* 1, fr. 18.9; *Aet.* 2, fr. 43.74; *Aet.* 3, fr. 75.21, ib.63; *Aet. inc. lib.*, fr. 186.10; *Hec.* frr. 71.3, 74.18, 103.1, 104 Hollis. Muse(s): *Iamb.* 1.17, ib.92; *Iamb.* 3.38; *Iamb.* 12.20; *Iamb.* 13.22, ib.26; *Iamb. inc. sed.*, fr. 218 Pf.; *Iamb. inc. sed.*, fr. 222.2 Pf., *Aet.* 1, fr. 1.2 Pf.; ib.24; ib.37; *Aet.* 1, fr. 2.2 Pf.; *Aet.* 4, fr. 86.1; *Aet.* 4, fr. 112.5, ib.9; cf. Puelma 1957. Both: *Iamb.* 1.8, *Iamb.* 13.1. Not to mention the *Hymns* (especially 2 (cf. Staehelin, H., *Die Religion des Kallimachos*, Diss. Tübingen: Laupp 1934, 41) and 4, but also 3.7, 83, 139, 169; 6.101).

[89] It should be noted that the Muses are, however, not mentioned in the extant text of the *Iamb.*

with (the Delian) Apollo, and that from birth (83-84).[90] Moreover, her remark that "silence is the best thing of all" (59) sounds like a typically Callimachean programmatic statement[91], which is echoed by the poet's call for silence in the first *Iamb* (31 σωπὴ γενέσθω[92]). Besides, the olive has the last word. The knot can be cut by taking a closer look at Callimachus' portrait of the debaters.[93] The olive adopts a modest attitude. Her pretended unobtrusiveness is apparent in different ways: she ironically disparages herself twice (13, 15); she ironically addresses the laurel (46 ὦ πάντα καλή[94])—like Callimachus addresses his critics in the first and thirteenth *Iamb*[95]—; she pretends to sing her own praise only because of the laurel's provocations (56-57 ἐπεὶ γὰρ ἐμνήσθης | καὶ τοῦτο), but to be reluctant[96] (59 ἀλλ' ἄριστον ἡ σωπή); she nobly pretends to refuse to boast or to disparage her adversary (60-61 ἐγὼ μὲν οὔτε χρηστὸν οὔτε σε γρύζω ἀπηνὲς οὐδέν); instead, she leaves it to two "out-siders", *in casu* birds sitting amidst her leaves, to sing her praise[97] (61-82); she even pretends to consider the flattering crow as loquacious[98] (63 κωτίλον; 81-82 φεῦ τῶν ἀτρύτων, οἷα κωτιλίζουσι· | λαιδρὴ κορώνη, κῶς τὸ χεῖλος οὐκ ἀλγεῖς;). The olive is not only a modest but also a subtle debater. Her subtlety is apparent from two wordplays on two different, but related, meanings of φαυλία[99] ("ordinary" and "common/

[90] Deubner, L., "Ein Stilprinzip hellenistischer Dichtkunst", *NJbb* 24, 1921, 373, observing that this "Trumpf-Aß" is marked by the olive's interruption of the crows' debate.

[91] Contra Clayman's categorical and off-putting statement (1980, 28): "...searching the text for subtle references to hidden agendas in an Alexandrian literary debate. There are none to be found."

[92] Pfeiffer *ad loc.*

[93] Cf. Howald 1943, 45; Puelma Piwonka 1949, 237-240; Sicherl 1978, 250; Hutchinson 1988, 50, 53.

[94] Puelma Piwonka 1949, 239; Clayman 1980, 24.

[95] *Iamb.* 1(fr. 191).33, *Iamb.* 13(fr. 203).24 ὦ λῷστ(ε); Pfeiffer *ad loc.*; Hutchinson 1988, 49-50.

[96] Cf. Puelma Piwonka 1949, 238.

[97] Gallavotti (1946, 17) interprets "il cicaleccio dei due uccelli" as "una briosa fantasia aristofanesca".

[98] Hutchinson 1988, 50; cf. Puelma Piwonka 1949, 238-239; Sicherl 1978, 251. One might compare Simichidas' modesty in Theoc. 7.37-38 (κἠμὲ λέγοντι | πάντες ἀοιδὸν ἄριστον· ἐγὼ δέ τις οὐ ταχυπειθής, | οὐ Δᾶν), which is, however, only a "pose" (Segal, C., "Simichidas' Modesty: Theocritus, *Idyll* 7.44", *AJPh* 95, 1974, 131; cf. eund. 1974a, 47; Puelma, M., "Die Dichterbegegnung in Theokrits 'Thalysien'", *MH* 17, 1960, 159).

[99] Thphr. *CP* 6.8.3, *HP* 2.2.12 (*coniecit Salmasius*), *Od.* 15; Luc. *Lex.* 5; Hsch. *s.* φαυλία· εἶδος ἐλαίας; Eust. *Il.* Ω 420 φαύλη ἐλαία ἡ μικρόκαρπος, ἡ καὶ φαυλία;

coarse (olive)" (13)) and τελεύτη ("end", of speech and of life (47)). She remains unmoved (45 μάλ' ἀτρεμαίως) and elegantly converts the laurel's contemptuous blame into her highest praise (46-48). This portrait of the olive markedly contrasts with that of the laurel, who addresses his opponent aggressively (18, 28, 37 ὤφρων ἐλαίη) and arrogantly claims his superiority (39 ἁ[γν]ὴ γάρ εἰμι[100], 40 ἱρὴ γάρ εἰμι).[101] The glaring contrast between the olive's modest, ironical and subtle debating technique and the laurel's arrogance[102] makes it *a priori* (or, rather, *a posteriori*) likely that the former's, not the latter's, part was written for Callimachus.

The function of the fable is to cut down the addressee to his real size. According to the diegete, Callimachus called Simos a "Thracian" and a "boy-thief"; both epithets may brand the addressee as a pederast.[103] When connected with the latter epithet (παιδοκλέπτης), the patronymicum by which the target of the *Iamb* is addressed gets an ironical undertone[104], based upon a wordplay: he corrupts παῖδες ("boys") but is himself a παῖς ("son" of Charitades). Also, if Simos is a pen name (see above), it is a nickname rather than a pet name. The laurel rants on about the bramble (101-106 at least[105]); these words—perhaps the *réplique finale* of the fable—seem applicable to the context, *casu quo* to Simos, too. At first sight, the proportions both within the fable and between the fable and its context seem somewhat odd: the son of Charitades disappears already after 5 to return only somewhere after 106[106] (as far as can be judged from the extant remnants of the context), and the bramble enters only in 95. This curious

Poll. 6.45; cf. Ath. *Epit.* 2, 56C; Σ *in* Pl. *Alc.* 147D (p. 108 Greene); Pfeiffer *ad loc.*, *ad Hec.* fr. 248 (fr. 36.4-5 Hollis); LSJ sv: "*a coarse kind of olive*, produced from the κότινος or wild-olive"; Eigler, U.-Wohrle, G.-Herzhoff, B., *Theophrast de Odoribus*, Stuttgart: Teubner 1993, 94.

[100] These words are quoted by Σ *in* E. *Hipp.* 138 (Schwartz II 23), but falsely (see Pfeiffer *ad* Call.) ascribed to Menander; therefore, the scholiast's quotation is not considered here to be an allusion to Callimachus' fable, as the former does not appear to realize that he is quoting from the latter.

[101] Cf. Puelma Piwonka 1949, 237; Muth 1951, 251, 253 (on 40).

[102] Puelma Piwonka 1949, 239: "Hybris und 'sagesse' stehen sich in diesen Fabelgestalten klar gegenuber". Archibald (1912, 77), however, states that both "personified plants" are characterized by "mildness".

[103] Pohlenz, M., "Der Romer Gaius bei Kallimachos", *Philologus* 90, 1935, 121, n. 3; Pfeiffer *ad Dieg.* 7.27.5; Trypanis 1958, 118-119, (first) n. a.

[104] Differently Puelma Piwonka 1949, 242: "die vertrauliche Anrede".

[105] Cf. Pfeiffer *ad* fr. 194.107-17 (quoted in n. 76 above).

[106] For the gap between 106 and 107, see again above, n. 76. 117 seems to be the last line of the *Iamb* (see Pfeiffer *ad loc.*).

composition seems deliberate and significant: the relatively few lines dedicated to the bramble in the fable and to the son of Charitades in the context can be interpreted as expressing their, i.e. the latter's, utter insignificance; Callimachus wishes not to waste words on him. In addition, the unconvential proportion between the fable and its context can be considered a typically Callimachean breaking with genre conventions.

Unorthodox proportions are not synonymous with disproportions.[107] On the contrary, the composition of the *Iamb*[108] is carefully balanced. Summarizing the dispute between the laurel and the olive prosaically—like the diegete (20T10): "They recounted their different useful qualities"—would do no justice to its sophisticated structure, as the following analysis may reveal. The debate between the two trees is a rhetorical ἀγών[109], consisting of two pairs of speeches. Both rounds of the debate are begun by the laurel; the olive retorts. The first two speeches are short, the last two long[110]. The second speech of the second pair, in its turn, comprises a kind of rhetorical debate, a catechetical discussion between two birds (probably two crows)[111]. These, in their turn, refer to yet another contest, this time between two gods (Athena versus Poseidon), Cecrops acting as referee. A parenthesis by the olive (81-82) announces the return from the discussion between the two birds to the dispute between the two trees. The next round of the debate between laurel and olive is cut off by the interruption of the bramble, who is put in his place by the laurel. The debate between the trees (the fable) is framed by a debate between humans (the context), which is interrupted by some outsider who is put in his place. Thus three eristic levels can be distinguished: first a

[107] Contra Nøjgaard (1964, 180), terming the fable "une composition monstrueuse avec cent vers de débat insignifiant et quelques vers...contenant la partie essentielle", and Howald (1943, 48), regarding, conversely, the context as "Nebensache", the fable as "das einzig Wichtige".

[108] Cf. the laudatory designations by Körte (1933, 239), Fraser (1972, I 742), and Sicherl (1978, 250).

[109] Cf. Dawson 1950, 52; Trypanis 1958, 119; Clayman 1980, 24, 26, 29; Adrados 1987a, 317.

[110] Puelma Piwonka (1949, 239, n. 2) thinks that Callimachus characterizes the laurel as μακρό-, the olive as ὀλιγόστιχος, but a juxtaposition of 18-43 and 46-92 shows that this is rather *vice versa*.

[111] Only from 82 κορώνη it is clear that one of the birds is a crow, whereas 63 ζεῦγος seems to imply that the birds are congeners (cf. LSJ sv); cf. Pfeiffer *ad* fr. 194.62; Fraser 1972, I 743; Clayman 1980, 25. Dawson (1950, 54), however, referring to Coppola, assumes that the crow's interlocutor is an owl.

human one (Callimachus vs. some rival, Simos), then a vegetal one (laurel vs. olive, bramble), finally a divine one (Pallas vs. Poseidon, Cecrops). Each level is connected with the previous one; the first connection is direct, the second one indirect: the poet himself tells about the quarrelling trees, whereas the olive has two birds tell about the quarrelling gods. In fact, thus, there are even four levels: the poet tells about trees who tell about birds who tell about gods. The order of the three debates is symmetrical:

human -
    vegetal -
        (ornithological)
                divine
        (ornithological) -
    vegetal -
human.

In other words, after the reference to the contest between the gods, the two birds continue chatting, after which the trees go on with their dispute, after which the poet harks back to the initial polemics. At all three levels some (pseudo-)arbiter occurs: Charitades' son tries to soothe the rivaling poets; the bramble the quarrelling trees; Cecrops judges (67 κἠδίκαζεν) the contending gods. The birds (the intermediary level), however, refuse to act as judge between the gods (72 οὐ διακρίνω) (the lower level) but do judge between the trees (the higher level). The *Iamb* is most truly a *Streitgedicht.* The theme of strife[112] is yet further emphasized by key-words (7, 95 νεῖκος; 66 [ἤρ]ιζ[ε; 87 καλλίνικος), comparatives (55 πλεῖον ἢ σύ, 57 κρέσσων (cf. the superlative 51 ἀριστέων; 58, 94 μέζων), 112 χείρων), the triple use of a wrestling metaphor (69, 78, 80), two references to prizes (33, 57 ἄεθλον) to be won at two (Pythian, Olympian) sport contests (58 ὡγών), and the mention of Ares (49) and enemies (99 ἐχθροῖς; cf. *Dieg.* 13 ⟨τοῖ⟩ς δυσ[μ]ενέσι). All three levels are similarly demarcated by the device of ring composition. Ironical questions (1, 103) open and announce the return to the context (the human level); localisations in Lydia (6-7, 106) open and announce the end of the fable (the vegetal level); references to "chattering" (63 κωτίλον ~ 81 κωτιλί-

[112] Cf. Clayman 1980, 23: "a fable about the evils of strife". Nevertheless, Korte asserts (1933, 239): "Man vergißt die polemischen Absichten des Dichters vollig uber der reizenden Fabel".

ζουσιν) open and announce the end of the debate between the birds (comprising the divine level).

Besides this symmetrical composition, the structure of the fable reveals yet another, numerical order, consisting in the dominance of the number three, which is both a rhetorical[113] and a story-telling[114] device. It has been shown above that there are three eristic levels. Horizontal and vertical tripartitions can be distinguished. On each level, three persons are involved in some conflict (cf. *Schol. in marg. sinistr.* 2/5 τ̣ρ̣ι̣τ̣[115])); at the same time, there are three combating couples (poet-rival, laurel-olive, Athena-Poseidon) and three (would-be) referees (Charitades' son, bramble, Cecrops). Tripartitions are omnipresent in the plants' speeches[116]. Furthermore, the birds refer to the three falls in wrestling (69 ἒν-78τ̣[ὸ δ]ε̣ὐ̣[τερ]ον-80 τὰ τρί'). The occurrence of the corresponding numerals τρὶς (31) and τρί' (80) might, therefore, be called thematic. Also, the plant fable contains three animal comparisons; one of these is applied to the olive by the laurel (22 λευκὸς ὡς ὕδρου γαστήρ), whereas two are applied to the laurel, one by the olive (46-48 τὸ κ[άλλιστον | ἐν τῇ τελευτῇ κύκνος [ὡς Ἀπόλλωνος | ἤεισας), one by the narrator (101-102 ὑπόδραξ οἷα ταῦρος[117] ἡ δάφνη | ἔβλεψε).

The sophisticated composition[118] places full emphasis upon the dispute between the trees, in which each tries to prove that he plays a more important part in human life, especially in religion, than the other. They pull out all rhetorical stops. Besides the tripartitions and irony discussed above, they use various tropes: anaphora (65 ὡς), chiasm[119] (70-71; the olive refutes the laurel's arguments in reverse order (47-92; see above)), metonymia[120] (cf. 49 Ἄρης; 52 Τηθύν; 53

---

[113] Clayman 1980, 26.

[114] Cf. e.g. Muller, C.W., "Die Witwe von Ephesus -Petrons Novelle und die "Milesiaka" des Aristeides", *A&A* 26, 1980, 106.

[115] Pfeiffer *ad loc.* : "fort. τρίτος".

[116] 24-25 τίς *ter*, 26-27 δάφνῃ-δάφνην *bis*, 18-28-37 ὤφρων ἐλαίη *ter*; cf. Muth 1951; Clayman 1980, 26-27. In view of the lacunal state of the papyrus, Clayman's observation (ib. 24-25) of three more tripartitions in verses 18-43 and 49-59 seems overconfident. On the other hand, to the three mentioned above she could have added three other words which occur thrice: μήτε (74), ἕν (75-77), οὐ μὰ (105-106).

[117] Cf. Capovilla 1967, II 50, 58, for the first and third comparison, respectively.

[118] This may have led Cahen (E., *Callimaque et son œuvre poétique*, diss. Paris: Boccard 1929, 584) to exclaim: "ne sommes-nous pas au moins sur la voie de l'art d'un La Fontaine...?"

[119] Clayman 1980, 24-27.

[120] Differently interpreted by Howald (see above, n. 78).

Τιθωνόν); rhetorical questions (laurel: 24-25, 28-31, cf. 102-103); olive: 57-58, 82; cf. poet: 1; cf. bramble: 103-105), aposiopesis (60-61); they adduce historical (28-31 Βράγχος) and mythological (77 Θησεύς, 84 Λητώ) exempla.

In addition, the fable has a structural function within its context at a higher level, Callimachus' book of *Iambs*. The fable serves to demarcate the end of its first part, which can be considered to be a metrical[121] (choliambic) and linguistic (Ionian) unity (*Iambs* 1-4). The overall composition of this part is symmetrical: the outer *Iambs* (1 and 4) are strikingly long, those in between strikingly short. This formal ring composition seems significant, for the fourth *Iamb* is the counterpart of the first one. Both comprise a second-degree story situated in Asia Minor[122], but their contents are opposite. The story about Bathycles' Cup (for which see the Appendix below) urges the literats not to rival, whereas the plant fable is a true *Streitgedicht*, warning inferior outsiders not to intervene in the disputes of rival superiors.[123] Besides this contrast, there is a curious coincidence. The first *Iamb* contains the precept μὴ σίμαινε (33[124])—literally: "don't be a σιμός"—, which, in a way, is the *Aussage* of the fourth *Iamb*, in which obviously Simos is an example unworthy of imitation. This connection pleas for taking Simos as an alias. It has already been observed above (nn. 92, 95) that in the same passage Callimachus, like the olive, both calls for silence and addresses his audience ironically. At the same time, there are several correspondences between the fourth and second *Iamb* (20F1). The greater part of both consists of a fable, told by (a) Lydian fabulist(s) (Aesop), (presumably) deriding rival poets under pseudonyms (Eudemos, Philton, Simos) and including a reference to a swan's song[125]. Finally (passing over various minor correspondences in several other *Iambs*[126]), the fourth *Iamb* has quite a lot in common

[121] See Gallavotti 1946, 14-17.

[122] Somewhat differently Howald 1943, 49: "beides sind literarische Erbstücke aus Ionien", from which he deduces that Callimachus is still "auf der Suche nach der eigenen Form".

[123] Contra Wimmel 1960, 127, n. 1.

[124] *Epim. alph. in Hom.* (I 138 Cramer): ἀπὸ τοῦ σιμὸς σιμαίνω (quoted by Pfeiffer *ad loc.*). Puelma Piwonka (1949, 213-214, n. 6), however, prefers to read σίλλαινε.

[125] *Dieg.* 6.24-25 ὁ κύ- | κνος, cf. fr. 192.17 ᾄδοντα ~ 20F2.47-48 κύκνος [ὡς... | ἤεισας; cf. Corbato 1979, 52 and see above.

[126] 20F2.105-106 ~ fr. 193.35sqq (ritual music for Cybele); cf. Trypanis 1958, 127, n. a. 20F2 ~ *Iamb.* 5(fr. 195).31 δάφνη. 20F2.7 ~ *Iamb.* 6(fr. 196 Pfeiffer).29 (Lydians). 20F2.68 ~ *Iamb.* 12(fr. 202 Pfeiffer).17 [ὄφις], cf. 23, 26, 47, 56, 62 (Olympus, Zeus, Delian Apollo).

with the last one, which is again written in choliambs (ring composition) and includes references to Apollo, Ionia, Doria, Lydia, an ironical address of a critic (see above, n. 95), and what seems to be a literal citation from the fable, about Leto's olive.[127] Besides, one might compare the lyrical poem entitled "Branchos", which some[128] consider to be the seventeenth *Iamb*, whose subject matter was the ritual cleansing of the Ionians adduced by the laurel as a historical example.[129] Also, there are some correspondences between the *Iamb* and the *Hecale*, notably the occurrence of two chattering birds and a reference to Theseus' meal.[130]

In addition, attention may be drawn to some connections between the fable in the fourth *Iamb* and the *Aetia*, which is not incompatible with the hypothesis of a joint edition referred to above. Apollo looms large both in the laurel's arguments and in the pro- and epilogue of the *Aetia*. More particularly, the *Daphnephoria Delphica* which is adduced by the laurel seem to have been described at greater length in the *Aetia*.[131] Finally, near the end of the prologue of the *Aetia* the poet seems to refer, like the olive, to Tithonus as a symbol of old age.[132]

---

[127] *Iamb.* 13(fr. 203 Pfeiffer; on its position, see Clayman, D.L., "Callimachus' Thirteenth Iamb: The Last Word", *Hermes* 104, 1976, 29-35).1 κἄπολλον, ib. 11 Ἴωσι, ib. 18 Ἰαστὶ, Δωριστὶ, ib. 47 Λυδὸν, ib. 62 ὡς τῆς ἐλαίης, ἣ ἀνέπαυσε τὴν Λητώ (cf. Puelma Piwonka 1949, 240, n. 3) ~ 20F2.7 οἱ...Λυδοί, 29 τῶν Ἰώνων, ib. 34 οἱ Δωριῆς, ib. 47 Ἀπόλλωνος, ib. 71 Ἀπόλλων, ib. 84 (cf. Pfeiffer *ad loc.*, who also points to *Hymn.* 4.262 (cf. Trypanis 1958, 125, n. d) and 321sqq *c.* Σ) τὸ τ]ῆς ἐλαίης ἣ ἀν[έπαυσ]ε τὴν Λητώ.

[128] Cahen, E., "L'œuvre de Callimaque: documents nouveaux", *REG* 48, 1935, 316, referring to Körte; Gallavotti 1946, 10; Ardizzoni 1963, 174, n. 21 (opposing the *communis opinio*; see ib. 167).

[129] 20F2.28-31 ~ *Lyr.* fr. 229 (cf. *Dieg.* 10.14-17); Trypanis 1958, 121, n. b; cf. Gallavotti 1946, 22. Curiously enough, Branchus is the name of the addressee of the first volume of Babrius' choliambic fable-collection (G19a.2), too.

[130] 20F2.61sqq ~ *Hec.* frr. 70, 73-74 Hollis (birds; cf. Bühler 1964, 234); 20F2.77 ~ *Hec.* fr. 36.4-5 Hollis (Theseus' meal; cf. Howald 1943, 47-48); cf. Dawson 1950, 54; Trypanis 1958, 119, 125, n. c. Barigazzi (1980, 247) compares the oaths in 20F2.105-106 with those in *Hec.* fr. 74.10-11 Hollis. Furthermore, Akte and Cecrops (20F2.68; Pfeiffer *ad loc.*) are also mentioned in *Hec.* fr. 1 and fr. 70.5 Hollis, respectively. Cf. Gallavotti 1946, 11 (in general).

[131] For Apollo, see above, n. 88. *Daphnephoria*: 20F2.34-36, 55-56 ~ *Aet.* 4, frr. 86(?)-89 (cf. *Dieg.* 2.10-28); Pfeiffer *ad loc.*; Trypanis 1958, 121, n. e; Bing 1988, 109, n. 35.

[132] 20F2.53 ~ *Aet.* 1, fr. 1.37-40 (see Crane 1986). Cf. furthermore 20F2.68 ~ *Aet.* 3, fr. 63.12 ([Ἀκτῆ]).

21. *Theocritus*

21A1 Theoc. 7.23: Lark and Her Father ? (*Aes.* 447)

Galen (21T1) reports that by ἐπιτυμβίδιοι[133] κορυδαλλίδες "they say that Theocritus alludes to" Aristophanes' fable (17F6) about the Crested Lark who buried her father in her head, "for they say that ἐπιτυμβίδιοι is equivalent to τὰς τὸν τύμβον ἐπὶ τῆς κεφαλῆς ἐχούσας." The anonymous interpreters of Theocritus referred to by Galen might be scholiasts; as a matter of fact, two scholia (21T2ab)[134] do explain the larks' epithet in a similar way[135]. However, the scholia give an alternative explanation: one of them (21T2a)[136] begins by paraphrasing ἐπιτυμβίδιοι by αἱ ἐπὶ τύμβου διατρίβουσαι. The latter interpretation of the composite adjective, that is, as "*tomb-haunting*", not "*tomb-crested*"[137], seems appropriate[138] in Theocritus' seventh idyll.

To begin with a negative argument, the alleged allusion to the aetiological fable does not seem to have any function in the *Thalysia*. It is true that larks occur again near the end of the poem (141), but here they are mentioned along with three other animal species[139], which contributes to the picturesque tone of the pastorale; the passage under discussion seems to be a similar case[140]. At the same time,

[133] Legrand (1898, 28) apparently thinks it to be an adjective of three instead of two endings.

[134] Like Zosimus in Berthelot's translation quoted by Legrand 1898, 27.

[135] Like Köhler (1881, 112), Rogers (1906, 59), Hausrath (1909, col. 1727), Thompson (1936, 168), Gow (A.S.F., "The Seventh Idyll of Theocritus", *CQ* 34, 1940, 52 contra Wilamowitz; in his commentary (*ad loc.*), however, Gow does not make a definite choice between the two explanations); cf. Dover, K.J., *Theocritus. Select Poems*, Basingstoke/London: MacMillan 1971, 152-153.

[136] The other scholium (21T2b) connects the two explanations with different animal species.

[137] Both translations by Gow *ad loc.* LSJ (sv) give even three translations: "*frequenting tombs*, or *with tomb-like crests*, or *with tombs in their heads* ". Neither makes a choice between the alternatives given; nor does Monteil, P., *Théocrite. Idylles*, Paris: PUF 1968, 107. Fritzsche (H.-Hiller, E., *Theokrits Gedichte*, Leipzig: Teubner 1881, 118, apparently prefers the first translation, Kelly (S.T., "The Song of Time: Theocritus' Seventh *Idyll*", *QUCC* 44, 1983, 105) the second one.

[138] Cf. Van Leeuwen 1902, 268, n. 3; Dunbar 1995, 327.

[139] 141-142 ἄειδον κόρυδοι καὶ ἀκανθίδες, ἔστενε τρυγών, | πωτῶντο ξουθαὶ περὶ πίδακας ἀμφὶ μέλισσαι [cf. 81].

[140] Cf. Bignone 1934, 45-46.

this subtle ring composition[141] has a different function: it symbolizes Simichidas' *Dichterweihe* by the contrast between the end of the journey, when larks are singing in a *locus amoenus*, and the outset, when there are not even any larks to be seen.[142] It is also true that the poem is highly allusive, but these allusions are mythological, clearly recognizable, and functional.[143]

On the other hand, the alternative, local explanation of the epithet fits perfectly in the context. First, in the preceding verse (22) Theocritus has Lycidas mention another animal—*in casu* a lizard—in combination with the place where it can usually be seen—*in casu* walls[144]—, but not now, in the noonday sun (in itself a typically bucolic[145] and supernatural[146] scene). Lycidas contrasts the two animal species with Simichidas *cum suis*, who does venture onto the road in the heat. Secondly, the road on which the friends are walking apparently leads past some memorial[147]. So Lycidas' second example

---

141 Cf. 140 (τέττιγεςᾀὀλολυγών (provided that Gow (*ad loc.*) is right in assuming that this is a frog)) ~ 41 βάτραχος...ποτ' ἀκρίδας, but this is a different case, as the latter line is of structural importance to the poem. Segal 1974a, 59: 131 ~ 1-4.

142 Segal 1974a, 36-37, 59-60, also comparing the larks' function in Theoc. 10.50-51. Pearce (1988, 292, referring to Gow 1952, II 127 and Arnott, W.G., "Lycidas and Double Perspectives: A Discussion of Theocritus' Seventh Idyll", *Est. Clas.* 87, 1984, 336-337) argues that "crested larks stop singing in mid-July", whereas "the action of the poem took place in August, or possibly July". Lawall (G., *Theocritus' Coan Pastorals. A Poetry Book*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP 1967, 104), however, is more to the point: "the concert of birds and insects...is not merely an accurate ornithological and entomological description; these...become symbolic of poetic utterance." Lawall also (ib. 76, 78) draws attention to two other instances of "verbal recall" in the poem's end from its beginning: 131-132 ~ 1-2, 136 ~ 8. Cf. Schonbeck, G., *Der locus amoenus von Homer bis Horaz*, Diss. Heidelberg 1962, 120-121.

143 47; 52-73; 149-152 (see Gow *ad loc.*). For the function of the numerous allusions to Homer and Hesiod, see Segal 1974a, 25, 27; cf. Horstmann, A.E.-A., *Ironie und Humor bei Theokrit*, Meisenheim am Glan: Hain 1976, 142.

144 7.22-23 ἁνίκα δὴ καὶ σαῦρος ἐν αἱμασιαῖσι καθεύδει | οὐδ' ἐπιτυμβίδιοι κορυδαλλίδες ἠλαίνοντι. Cf. Muller, D., "Eidechsen bei Theokrit und Virgil", *Hermes* 71, 1936, 474-475; Valk, M. van der, "Le thème de la septième Idylle de Théocrite", *REG* 98, 1985, 140, n. 20.

145 Schwinge, E.-R., "Theokrits 'Dichterweihe' (id. 7)", *Philologus* 118, 1974, 49; Segal 1974a, 36 with n. 58; Zagagi, N., "Self-Recognition in Theocritus' Seventh Idyll", *Hermes* 112, 1984, 429, n. 12; Vara 1992, 336; cf. Ott, V., *Die Kunst des Gegensatzes in Theokrits Hirtengedichte*, Hildesheim/New York: Olms 1969, 12.

146 Krevans, N., "Geography and the Literary Tradition in Theocritus 7", *TAPhA* 113, 1983, 202-203, referring to Cameron, A., "The Form of the 'Thalysia', in: *Miscellanea di studi alessandrini in memoria di Augusto Rostagni*, Torino 1963, 303.

147 7.10-11 κοὔπω τὰν μεσάταν ὁδὸν ἄνυμες, οὐδὲ τὸ σᾶμα | ἁμῖν τὸ Βρασίλα κατεφαίνετο...; cf. Gow *ad* 23.

drawn from nature would be to the point: his audience could *observe*[148] the absence of larks from the graves (tomb-stones have been found somewhere around there, indeed[149]).

Finally, the interpretation of ἐπιτυμβίδιοι as a reference to the larks' habitat, not to Aesop's fable, is confirmed by comparing (1) a Babrian fable (!), in which graves are said to be the lark's favourite biotope[150]—one might adduce Galen, too, who reports that the bird can often be seen along the roads (ὃ καὶ κατὰ τὰς ὁδοὺς πολλάκις ὁρῶμεν)—, and (2) the common usage of ἐπιτυμβίδιος[151] and its synonym ἐπιτύμβιος[152], meaning "*at* or *over a tomb*"[153].

22. *Cercidas*

22A1 Cerc. fr. 7 Lomiento *ap.* Stob. 4.16.7: Tortoise, Zeus (*Aes.* 106)

A fragment from Cercidas (*POxy* 1082, fr. 7) can be supplemented by a quotation by Stobaeus from the poet's *Meliambs* (22T1):

"remember the (words) of the shrivelled tortoise on the land: 'home is truly always the best and dearest[154] thing'".

Cercidas' tortoise here uses a proverb[155]—more or less equivalent to the English "home is where the heart is"—, which has a comical

---

[148] Cf Segal 1974a, 47

[149] Paton, W R, "Theocritus Idyll VII Haleis and Pyxa", *CR* 2, 1888, 265, Παντελίδης, Σ Κ, "Θεοκρίτου ἐαρινὴ ὁδοιπορία βεβαιουμένη ἐξ ἐπιγραφῶν ἀνεκδοτῶν", *BCH* 14, 1890, 292-300

[150] Babr 72 20 κορυδαλλὸς οὐν τάφοις παίζων, cf Ulbricht (1908, 30), Keller (1913, 85) and Gow lc Some suggest that Babrius (lc) alludes to Theoc lc (Gow lc, Herrmann 1973 (for which see the critical reviews by Bardon, H, *REA* 76, 1974, 162, Lasserre, F, *AC* 44, 1975, 259-260, Vaio, J, *CW* 69, 1975, 329, Bannert, H, *Gymnasium* 83, 1976, 477-479, Bompaire, J, *REG* 89, 1976, 652-653, Williams, F, *JHS* 96, 1976, 188), 85) or Ar lc (Thompson 1936, 168), but this is unlikely

[151] A *Ch* 342, *IG* 14 1409 5 (LSJ sv; cf Gow lc)

[152] A *A* 1547, *Ch* 334, S *Ant* 901, *APl* 5 368 3, *Epigr Gr* 339 1 Kaibel, Leon *AP* 7 657 11

[153] LSJ svv

[154] φίλος is, like ἄριστος, predicate nominal Keller (1913, 250), however, referring to Ludwig, takes φίλος, and Paquet (1990, 133) ἄριστος, as an adjective with οἶκος

[155] Cic *Att* 4 8 1, 15 16a, Apostol 12 39 (Arsen 38 68) Livrea (1986, 91) usefully compares Hes *Op* 365 (see West *ad loc*), *h.Merc* 36, S fr 934 Radt, and, less usefully, Pers 4 52 Cf Liv 36 32, Plu *Flam* 17, *Mor* 197BC

effect[156]. The same happens in an aetiological fable, which explains "how the tortoise got its shell"[157] and to which Cercidas in all probability alludes[158]: When Zeus invited all animals at his wedding banquet, only the tortoise came in too late; when the tortoise explained that he loved his home so much, Zeus punished him by having him carry his beloved home on his back ever since.[159]

As the direct context of the above fragment has not been preserved, reconstructions of the quondam function of the allusion must remain tentative. However, rather than acquiescing in a *non liquet*, two hypotheses can be argued for.

First, the shell-carrying tortoise might be connected with Diogenes, and the former's shell with the latter's knapsack[160], the emblem of the Cynic's αὐτάρκεια[161]. This interpretation is in accordance with the above fragment's context in Stobaeus (Περὶ ἡσυχίας)[162] and can be supported by a passage from one of the letters ascribed to Diogenes. In the epistle referred to here, Socrates, showing Diogenes the truly Cynic way[163] of life, puts a knapsack on his pupil's shoulders, and adds by way of explanation: "Thus you may carry your house [οἰκίαν...περιφέρῃς] wherever you go."[164] This is a striking (if rather late) parallel indeed, as the tortoise[165] was indicated by the *kenning* φερέοικος (*EM*).

---

[156] Cf. *App. Prov.* 4.15 (Plu. *Prov.* 11 Crusius (O., *Plutarchi de proverbiis Alexandrinis libellus ineditus*, Tubingen: Fues 1887, 9; cf. eund., *Ad Plutarchi de proverbiis Alexandrinis libellum commentarius*, Tubingen: Armbruster/Riecker 1895, 40): ἔνιοι τὴν παροιμίαν ἐπὶ τὸ γελοιότερον μεταφράζοντες, ταύτην ἐπὶ τῆς χελώνης φασίν. Cf. Livrea 1986, 91.

[157] Handford 1954, 68.

[158] Adrados lc; cf. Powell, I.U., *Collectanea Alexandrina*, Oxford 1925 (repr. Chicago: Ares 1981), *ad* Cerc. fr. 2.

[159] *Fab. aes.* 108 Hausrath (*Aes.* 106); Adrados 1987a, 120.

[160] Not his jar (contra Gerhard 1909, 207, n. 6 (differently id., "Kerkidas", *RE* 11.1, Stuttgart: Metzler 1921, col. 303: neither "Faß" nor "Ranzen"); contra: Lomiento 1993, 295-296).

[161] *AP* 7.65-68, 11.158; D.L. 6.2 (33) (*Test.* 98, 112-115, 154 Giannantoni); Lomiento 1993, 296.

[162] Contra Livrea 1986, 90: "La χελώνη come simbolo della λιτότης non spiegherebbe la presenza della citazione cercidea nella sez. περὶ ἡσυχίας di Stobeo".

[163] Using Hesiod's image of the crossroads (*Op.* 287-292, for which see the Appendix below).

[164] Ps.-Diog. *Ep.* 30 [Διογένης·] "τὴν δὲ πηρὰν διὰ τί μοι περιτέθεικας;" "ἵνα πάντῃ τὴν οἰκίαν" εἶπε [*sc.* Σωκράτης] "περιφέρῃς."

[165] And the snail: Hes. *Op.* 571, Cic. 2.133 *domiporta*; see Pease, A.S., *M. Tulli Ciceronis de divinatione*, U of Illinois Studies in Language and Literature 8, 1923 (repr. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft 1963, 560); Hsch. φ 305 Schmidt (adding: ἔνιοι ζῷον ὅμοιον γα[λ]λῇ ὑπὸ δ(ρ)υσὶ καὶ ἐλάταις γινόμενον. οἱ δὲ ζῷον

A second hypothesis stands or falls with the legitimacy of connecting the fragment under discussion with Cercidas' second *Meliamb* (*sub fine*[166]; in v. 32 rather[167] than in v. 30), whose theme is love[168]. As the tortoise is connected with Aphrodite Urania[169] and symbolizes (particularly feminine) conjugal fidelity[170], and as earlier in the poem a quiet and calm sex life is described in favourable terms (4-7), the function of the allusion to the fable could be interpreted as a plea for love within matrimony[171]; this would again be in accordance (or at least not irreconcilable[172]) with the Stobaean context of the fragment. It is significant in this connection that in the fable probably alluded to Zeus is celebrating his marriage. At the same time, however, the (supposed) application of the fable to its context might be called ironical in two respects: the very symbol of marital fidelity was the only animal *not* to attend Zeus' wedding feast in time, and the fable explains the inseparable bond between the tortoise and its shell as a divine punishment. These typically Cynic overtones would correspond with the malicious ambiguity[173] of Πειθώ in the *Meliamb* (7, 13): on the one hand, the name (of an Oceanid) is appropriate in the

σφηκὸς μεῖζον); Wærn 1951, 119-120; Lomiento 1993, 295. For two aetiological fables explaining "warum die Schnecke ihr Haus tragen muß", see Dähnhardt 1912, 275-276.

[166] See Knox, A.D., *Herodes, Cercidas and the Greek Choliambic Poets*, Loeb, 1946, 205; Livrea 1986, 71; Lomiento 1993, 103.

[167] Lomiento 1993, 103 contra Livrea 1986 (followed by López Cruces, J.L., *Les Méliambes de Cercidas de Mégalopolis. Politique et tradition littéraire*, Amsterdam: Hakkert 1995, 221, n.17); cf. Knox, lc.

[168] 2 τὸν...παῖδ' Ἀφροδίτας, 6 Ἔρωτος, 9 πόθων, 14 Κύπριν, 26 ἀ... Ἀφροδίτα.

[169] This bond was depicted in a statue by Phidias in Elis. See Plu. *Mor.* 142D, 381E; Paus. 6.25; Keller 1913, 250; Livrea 1986, 91-92, referring to Déonna, W., "Aphrodite sur la tortue", *RHR* 81, 1920, 135-144; Cumont, F., "L"Aphrodite à la tortue' de Doura Europos", *Monuments Piot* 27, 1924, 31-43; Settis, S., *ΧΕΛΩΝΗ. Saggio sull'Afrodite Urania di Fidia*, Pisa 1966.

[170] Livrea (1986, 92) compares also Erinna, *SH* 401.5 (see Arthur, M.B., "The Tortoise and the Mirror: Erinna *PSI* 1090", *CW* 74, 1980, 53-65) and Ath. 13, 589A; cf. furthermore above, Achae. 15A1.

[171] Knox's interpretation (1924, 104; contra: Livrea 1986, 90; but see Gerhard 1909, 247 contra Bergk and Crusius) of the allusion as a reference to Diogenes' shocking obscenities described by his namesake (D.L. 6.2 (46); cf. Diog. *Ep.* 35) seems less to the point.

[172] Lomiento's objection (1993, 294) that "L'ἡσυχία...non è da intendere necessariamente in senso erotico" is unconvincing.

[173] Livrea (1986, 80), referring to Σ *in* E. *Phoen.* 1116 for the Oceanid and to Pi. fr. 122.1-2 Snell, Men. *Epitr.* 555-556 and Ath. 13.37, 577A for the prostitution; cf. Buxton, R.G.A., *Persuasion in Greek Tragedy. A Study of* Peitho, Cambridge...: UP 1982, 35-39, 44.

description of a calm sea as a nautical metaphor for erotic tranquility; on the other hand, the name is connected also with prostitution. Thus, the tortoise is presented as an example worthy of imitation, but his behaviour is not irreproachable.[174]

Conclusion

Two fully-fledged fables occur in Callimachus. These are remarkably similar, both formally and functionally. Some caution, it must be said, is needed in view of the lacunal papyrus, although the *Diegeseis* are particularly helpful in reconstructing the fables.

---

[174] Livrea's (at any rate overconfident) assumption (1986, 90) that Cercidas alludes also to the fable about the tortoise who longed to fly but was dashed against the rocks by an eagle (*Aes.* 230; references given above, Achae. 15A1, n. 12) seems too speculative, although it cannot definitely be ruled out, if only in view of the lacunal state of the papyrus. It depends not only upon a connection of frr. 7 + 2 Lomiento, but presupposes also a pregnant interpretation of 30 ῥικνᾶς and γα[(apart from a refusal of thinking of other words containing the syllable γα): a shrivelled, *casu quo* old and wise, tortoise stays where he belongs, on the ground, which may be taken to imply that a foolish one does not. Looking for additional arguments, Livrea adduces 2 κυανοπτέρυγον and 24 Ἰκαρο[] πλόος. As for the former, the negative connotation of wings does seem relevant to an interpretation of the passage at hand as an allusion to a fable about a flying turtle; as for the latter, however, the only trace left by the reckless youth (whose tragic end would, admittedly, have been a striking mythological parallel to the lethal fall of the would-be aeronaut in the fable indeed) in the papyrus is one meagre ρ.

Yet Livrea's hypothesis could be built on, the *Meliamb* discussing also the drawbacks of love. Cercidas emphasizes that reckless sexual behaviour turns out badly: passionate love is perilous (8-10), womanizers will repent and whore-hoppers meet with contempt (24-29). There is, however (as in the other tortoise fable), a snake in the grass, for prostitution is first elaborately, and not uninvitingly (so much so that Knox (1924, 104) thought that "the poem...recommends the love of the marketplace"), described (26-28) before it is rejected, and that only ironically (29; see Livrea 1986 *ad loc.*). Even so, an allusion to the fateful end of the tortoise that went beyond the natural bounds seems appropriate for dissuading from sexual extravaganza. Thus Cercidas' (supposed) double allusion would be ambiguous: one tortoise is judged positively, the other negatively. This (assumed) metaphorical ambiguity at the poem's end would correspond with the ambiguity of Eros, which dominates the first half of the poem from the very start (1-10; the first word reads δοιά; cf. 11 [12 according to Lomiento, L., "Nota a Cercida, fr. 2, 11-12 D. (= 2, 11-12 Livrea)", *QUCC n.s.* 27 (56).3, 1987, 97-100] δύ' ὄντων) and is elaborated in a nautical metaphor. This ring composition of equivocal images would strengthen the inner coherence of the poem and could be considered to constitute a point in favour of the interpretation of the passage under discussion as a simultaneous (if unparalleled) allusion to two tortoise fables.

Both occupy the greater part of one of Callimachus' *Iambs*, are written in the same metre and dialect, are explicitly ascribed, or refer more subtly, to Aesop, and contain many typically fabulistic elements (notably *kenningar* (as in 3F1, from Nicander, another Hellenistic poet), which might be connected with the intellectual character of Hellenistic Poetry in general and the erudition displayed by Callimachus in particular)[175].

Both fables are unconventional (and as such typically Callimachean), the first in that its narrator and addressee are mentioned only in the epimythium, the second by virtue of its exceptional length (both absolutely and in proportion to its context) and profusion of toponyms.

The structure of both fables is complex; the second *Iamb* turns out to be a second-degree narrative, whereas the fourth is an ingeniously symmetrical composition of three (or even four) levels, which are thematically and formally interconnected, and demarcated by ring compositions.

The first fable is an aetiology, the second a *Streitgedicht*, but both bear witness to the genre's protean character, in that they function as a literary satire, presumably deriding rival poets under pseudonyms; both fables convey irony. The poet himself identifies with the narrator of the first and a character of the second fable. At a higher level, both can be connected with other *Iambs* (especially with the first) and the *Aetia*.

As regards the other Hellenistic poets, it is questionable whether one of Theocritus' *Idylls* refers to a fable from Aristophanes' *Birds* (17F6), although Galen reports that some state that it does.

Cercidas' *Meliambs* do contain one allusion to a fable, but its (originally aetiological) function is unclear, as its direct context has been lost. It can be interpreted either as representing the truly Cynic way of life, or—if it is to be connected with the *Meliamb* on Love—as recommending marital fidelity, if not without irony.

[175] See, e.g, Hutchinson 1988, 6sqq, 26sqq; Bulloch 1989, 2-3, 30.

CHAPTER SEVEN

EPIGRAM[1]

23. *[Aeschylus]*

23A1 [A.], *AP* 10.110: Lion's Cub and Man (not in *Aes.*)

This epigram is a literal quotation of the Aristophanic Aeschylus' allusion in *Frogs* (Ar. 17A6 = [A.] 23T1) to the fable of the Man who reared a Lion's Cub in *Agamemnon* (A. 12F2). For want of context, however, the specific, originally comic and tragic applications of the fable to Athenian politics and the Trojan War (and the house of Atreus), respectively, have faded into the background, if perhaps not for the well-read. As it stands, the allusion has a general, gnomic function.

24. *Sophocles*[2]

24A1 S. fr. 4 West *ap.* Hieronym. Rhod. fr. 35 Wehrli *ap.* Ath. 13.82, 604D-F: Helios and Boreas (*Aes.* 46)

Athenaeus (24T2), paraphrasing Hieronymus of Rhodes (24T1), quotes the following[3] epigram, which he ascribes to Sophocles:

"Helios it was, and not a boy, Euripides, who by his heat stripped me of my cape; but with you, when you were embracing another man's wife[4], Boreas consorted. So you are not so clever, because when sowing in another's field, you bring Eros into court for thieving."[5]

---

[1] The present chapter excludes fables occurring in epigrams included in the *Garland of Philip*, as these are either undatable or belong to the (early) Imperial Age; see Gow-Page 1965, I, p. XIII and 1968, I, p. VII. For the epigram ascribed to Aesop, see the Appendix below.

[2] See also above, S. 13F1-2, 14F1.

[3] Although Rutherford (1883, p. XXVII) deemed it "stained too black with Greek manners to be cited".

[4] †ἑταίραν, an "incurable" corruption (Page 1981, 304, observing that "the object of φιλοῦντι...is the boy", and approving of τάλαν, suggested by West (*in app. crit.*)).

[5] The translations in this section are by Gulick 1937, VI 259-261.

Athenaeus reports that Sophocles here "refers to the fable of the Sun and the North Wind" (χρησάμενος τῷ περὶ τοῦ 'Ηλίου[6] καὶ Βορέου λόγῳ). Of this fable[7] many versions[8] have been preserved, both in and outside the collections. The contents of the fable are—setting aside minor variations[9]—roughly as follows: the Sun and the North Wind quarrelled over whose power was the greatest. They decided to test their strength by trying to have a traveller pull out his clothes. Boreas blew, but the man only tightened his clothes. When the Sun began to shine, first mildly but then turning up the heat, the man voluntarily stripped, thus demonstrating that gentle persuasion is more effective than violent coercion.

Athenaeus reports that Hieronymus related in his *Historical Notes* that Sophocles composed the above elegiac distichs to meet with Euripides' jest. Sophocles had laid down with a handsome youth outside the walls. The youth spread his cloak on the grass, while Sophocles wrapped his cape around them. After intercourse (ὁμιλία), the boy took Sophocles' χλανίς and ran away, leaving his ἱμάτιον to Sophocles. This incident was, understandably, on everyone's lips. When Euripides heard of it, he mocked his tragedian colleague and said that he had had an encounter with the same boy without, however, losing his mantle.

In the epigram ascribed to Sophocles the originally metaphorical divine antagonists of the fable are taken literally; the same goes for the human protagonist's stripping. Sophocles defends himself against Euripides' derision by referring to the weather conditions: he suggests that he stripped because of the heat, whereas Euripides did not because it was cold at the time. This implies that the one human fable character stands for both tragedians successively, first for Euripides, then for Sophocles[10]; the latter thus elegantly drives home that *he* stripped voluntarily, just like the man in the final stage of the fable.

---

[6] It is preferable to write the initial letter both in the context and in the epigram (with West) as a capital, not (with Page 1981, 304) in lower case, as the Sun God is a fable character.

[7] Contra Neubner 1889, 34: "in mythologicis...habendum esse narrationibus, non in apologis".

[8] Babr. 18, Plu. *Mor.* 139DE, Them. *Or.* 16, 208a, Avian. 4, *fab. aes.* 46 Hausrath, Synt. 55, *Syr.* 81 Lefèvre, *Pa.Bodl.* 73 Chambry, *Dod.* ibid., *Tetr.* 1.47 (*Aes.* 46; Adrados 1987a, 439 (medieval versions)).

[9] See Adrados 1987a, 69-70 (where the addition of Jove in Avian. 4.2 could yet be added).

[10] Cf. Page's analysis (1981, 303).

At the same time, the allusion to the fable, in particular the contrast between the burning rays of the sun and the cutting wind, has an erotic overtone: Sophocles seems to insinuate that he is a more passionate lover than Euripides. This erotic interpretation of the allusion to the fable does not seem far-fetched, in view of several sexual *double entendres* in the epigram: χλιαίνων, ὡμίλησε, σπείρων, ἀπάγεις[11]. In the epigram Sophocles not only defends himself but also counterattacks; Athenaeus reports that Hieronymus says that Sophocles "also alludes lightly to [παραινιττόμενος] Euripides' practice of adultery", thus exposing the inconsistency in Euripides' conduct, which amounts to the pot calling the kettle black.

The title of Hieronymus' work paraphrased by Athenaeus should not prevent doubts to be raised about the historicity of the anecdote reported, *casu quo* Sophocles' authorship of the epigram.[12] On the one hand, Sophocles is notorious for his pederasty[13], but, on the other, the dramatist's biography for its "Fabeleien", and Hieronymus for his "Kritiklosigkeit"[14].

25. *Socrates*

25F1 Socr. fr. [1] West *ap.* D.L. 2.5 (42), *API* 4.16: ? (*Aes.* 424; cf. *Aes.* T40)

Diogenes Laertius (25T1) quotes the *incipit* (ἡ ἀρχή) of a fable by Socrates:

"Judge not, ye men of Corinth," Aesop cried,
"Of virtue as the jury-courts decide."[15]

The above elegiac distich probably served as a promythium. The

---

[11] For the ambiguity of χλιαίνω, cf. Mel. 117 Gow-Page, *AP* 12.125.8; with the sexual connotation of ὁμιλέω compare of course ὁμιλία in Athenaeus' very paraphrase of Hieronymus some lines before the epigram (13.82, 604E); the metaphorical use of σπείρω may go without comment; the *double entendre* of ἀπάγεις (taken as unequivocal by Page 1981, 303) is explained by Gulick 1937, VI 260, n. a (compare again ἀπήγαγε in Athenaeus' paraphrase of Hieronymus).

[12] Perry 1962, 308; West 1974, 20-21; Page 1981, 304; Radt, *TragGrF* IV 62; Wehrli *ad* Hieronym. Rhod. fr. 35; Adrados 1991a, 37. The latter elsewhere (1979a, 415) suggests that the epigram is from some tragedy by Sophocles, but this is obviously not the case.

[13] Ath. 13.81, 603E φιλομεῖραξ δὲ ἦν ὁ Σοφοκλῆς. See the *testimonia amatoria* collected by Radt, *TragGrF* IV 59sqq.

[14] Lesky 1971, 778; cf. Dorrie, H., "Hieronymos (4)", *DKP* 2, col. 1138.

[15] Translation by Hicks 1925, I 173.

fable proper has been lost and cannot be ascertained.[16] Diogenes characterizes the fable as such by a terminological indication (μῦθον) and an ascription to the name of Aesop (Αἰσώπειον), who is presented as the narrator of the fable (Αἴσωπος...ἔλεξε). In addition, the introductory description of the context[17] contains also the typically indefinite time adjunct ποτε.

The term "presentation in the third degree," grafted onto Adrados' "presentación en segundo grado" (1979a, 160), might perhaps be introduced to denote the threefold stratification of the narrative: in Diogenes, Socrates has Aesop[18] tell the fable to the Corinthians. At the first level, remnants of the context exist, as the promythium indicates the fable's audience (Κορίνθιον ἄστυ νέμουσι), theme (ἀρετὴν), and (persuasive[19]) function (μὴ κρίνειν). At the second level, Diogenes reports that Socrates composed the fable in prison (δεθεὶς) shortly before his death (μετ' οὐ πολλὰς ἡμέρας ἔπιε τὸ κώνειον). Although, strictly speaking, its context has not survived, one[20] could imagine that Socrates (allegedly) applied the fable to his actual situation, as he had just (but unjustly (cf. μὴ)) been sentenced (cf. κρίνειν) by the Athenian jury court (cf. λαοδίκῳ σοφίῃ). At the third level, the fable is part of Diogenes' biographical account of Socrates' last days. The inclusion of the distich in the *Anthologia Graeca* (25T2) entails the complete loss of the third level (cf. 23A1), whereas the only trace of the second one is the ascription to Socrates.

The ascription of the fable under discussion to Socrates cannot be authenticated. First, Diogenes is obviously following Plato's *Phaedo* (Socr. 46T1), which he himself reports (ἃ Πλάτων ἐν τῷ Φαίδωνί φησιν) is the main source for the present section of his biography. But, on the one hand, Plato just says that Socrates composed "fables"

[16] Hausrath (1909, col. 1732), referring to Koraes, however, thinks that the fable somehow resembled "dem..., den Aesop nach dem Volksbuch [?] den Delphiern vor seinem Tode vorhielt (Halm and Hausrath 3)"; cf. Jedrkiewicz 1989, 370, n. 69 contra Grauert 1825, 54, "che ritiene [*quod non*] trattarsi qui de 'le rane che chiedono un re' [*Aes.* 44]". For Gal. *Protr.* 13, see the Appendix below.

[17] Not the fable (contra Adrados 1979a, 398); cf. Nøjgaard 1964, 460 (this is not to say that Nøjgaard is right in deducing that the use of ποτε in fables derives from a similar use of ποτε in contexts).

[18] Not Socrates himself (contra Jedrkiewicz 1989, 288).

[19] Political according to Jedrkiewicz 1989, 74, n. 15, comparing Arist. 39F2.

[20] Hertzberg 1826, 128; Jedrkiewicz 1989, 369-370, n. 69. Perhaps Diogenes' addition οὐ πάνυ ἐπιτετευγμένως (see below) is to be taken to refer to Socrates' failure to change the situation.

but does not exemplify these; various authors (Plutarch, Augustin, Avian and Psellus (Socr. 46T2-3, 46T5-6)) follow Plato; only the *Suda* (25T2) speaks of one single "Aesopic fable" (μῦθον Αἰσώπειον), but the lexicographer's account seems to be based upon Diogenes'[21], although the former reports that the fable was "in dactyls" (δι' ἐπῶν; cf. Plutarch ἔπεσιν ἐνήρμοζεν) and does not even quote its *incipit*. On the other hand, the reliability of Plato's testimony itself is under debate (see below, Socr. 46T1).

Secondly, Socrates' authorship of the paean[22] whose opening line Diogenes quotes just before the above promythium was denied already by Dionysiodorus, as Diogenes himself adds (Διονυσόδωρος δέ φησι μὴ εἶναι αὐτοῦ τὸν παιᾶνα). This seems to make the genuineness of the fable questionable, too, since, according to Plato (and Diogenes), Socrates allegedly composed both under the same circumstances.

Finally, Diogenes' qualification of the fable as an inferior piece of work (οὐ πάνυ ἐπιτετευγμένως) is not exactly to the credit of its authenticity[23].

26. *Leonidas*

26F1 Leon. 32 Gow-Page, *AP* 9.99: He-Goat and Vine (*Aes.* 374)

"The nanny-goat's nimble, bearded spouse once in a vineyard nibbled all the tender leaves of a vine. The vine spoke thus to him from the ground: 'Cut close with thy jaws, accursed beast, my fruitful branches; my stem is entire, and shall again send forth sweet nectar enough to serve as a libation for thee, goat, when thou art sacrificed.'"[24]

---

[21] Compare the *Suda* ἔγγραφον οὐδὲν καταλιπὼν ἤ, ὥς τινες βούλονται, ὕμνον εἰς Ἀπόλλωνα καὶ Ἄρτεμιν with D.L. ἀλλὰ καὶ παιᾶνα κατά τινας ἐποίησεν, οὗ ἡ ἀρχή· Δήλι' Ἄπολλον χαῖρε, καὶ Ἄρτεμι, παῖδε κλεεινώ (Socr. fr. [2] West); Pl. τὸ εἰς τὸν Ἀπόλλω προοίμιον.

[22] Not of the fable (contra Hausrath 1909, col. 1732); rightly Schanz 1894, 598.

[23] Nøjgaard (1964, 509, contra Perry 1940, 392, n. 3; but cf. Grauert 1825, 54; Neubner 1889, 35; Schanz 1894, 598, referring to Bernhardy, contra Müller and Bergk; Gerhard 1909, 276 contra Welcker; Robin 1963, 6, n. 1; Jedrkiewicz 1989, 370, n. 69) and Luzzatto (1988, 445), however, stand up for the dependability of Diogenes' testimony (cf. Dressel 1876, 28).

[24] Translation by Paton 1917, III 53. The final pentameter is identical with the last verse of a distich by Euenus [contra Adrados 1979a, 492] 3 Gow-Page, *AP* 9.75

This epigram, paraphrased by the lemmatist (26T1), versifies a fable which probably derives from the story of Ahiqar[25] and has ended up in the collections[26]. The indefinite introductory time adjunct (ποθ'; cf. Socr. 25F1), as well as the enigmatic periphrasis (*kenning*) of the he-goat in the first line—the riddle ("Ἴξαλος εὐπώγων αἰγὸς πόσις) is solved by the direct address (τράγε) only in the last line—, may[27] be considered to be characteristic of the genre.

An epimythium or any other indication of a metaphorical interpretation of the fable is lacking. The epigram does contain, however, a clue for its evaluation: the vine, who utters the *réplique finale*, strongly disapproves of the he-goat's action (κάκιστε).

27. *Antipater of Sidon*

27F1 Antip. Sid.[28] 63 Gow-Page, *AP* 7.210: Viper and Swallow (cf. *Aes.* 227)

"Just when thou hadst become the mother, swallow, of a new-born brood, just when thou first wast warming thy children under thy wings, a many-coiled serpent, darting into the nest where lay thy

---

ap. CIL 4.3704.6 (on a Pompeian fresco, simultaneously depicting both stages of the fable; see Kaibel, G., *Epigrammata Graeca ex lapidibus conlecta*, Berlin/Frankfurt 1878 (repr. Hildesheim: Olms 1965), 499 (no. 1106)), Suet. *Dom.* 14, *Suda* α 4177 Adler, Tz. *in* Ar. *Pl.* 1129; cf. Ov. *F.* 1.357-358. West ((M.) 1969, 116) and Lausberg (1982, 211) think that Euenus copies Leonidas, but Gow-Page (1968, II 291) "think it very probable that the couplet is a relatively old one, known to Leonidas, who adopted its second line for a context of its own."

[25] Gazelle (Goat in the Armenian version; Noldeke 1913, 45-46 (noting a structural difference)) and Madder; Bevan, E., *The Poems of Leonidas of Tarentum...*, Oxford: Clarendon P 1931, 104; Perry 1962, 322-323; West (M.) 1969, 116-117; Adrados 1979a, 492 and 1987a, 413. Brunner (1980, 199) suggests that Leonidas' direct source was either Theophrastus' *Ahiqar* translation (for which see the Appendix below) "or an oral version", and (ib. 200) unconvincingly considers Paus. 2.38.3, an aetiological λόγος about an ass teaching the pruning of vines by nibbling down its shoots, to be "an interesting transformation of this story".

[26] Contra Olivieri, A., *Epigrammatisti greci della Magna Grecia e della Sicilia*, Napoli: Libreria Scientifica 1949, 93: Aphth. 37 (*fab. aes.* 327 Hausrath); *Pa.Bodl.* 339 Chambry; *Dod.* ibid., *Tetr.* 1.7. The theme occurs also in Latin literature: Ov. *Met.* 1.114-115; Mart. 3.24.1-2; Adrados 1987a, 412 (to which Serv. *in* Verg. *G.* 2.380 may be added).

[27] Geffcken (1897, 94) compares *Il.* 4.105 ἰξάλου αἰγός, Agath. *AP* 6.32.2-4 ἴξαλον...τράγον (last word!); Theoc. 8.49 τράγε, τᾶν...αἰγῶν ἄνερ, Verg. *Ecl.* 7.7 *vir gregis...caper*, Hor. *C.* 1.17.7.

[28] See Setti 1890, 76-77; Waltz 1906a, 19.

young, robbed thee of the fruit of thy womb. Then when with all his might he came to slay thee, too, as thou wast lamenting them, he fell into the greedy breath of the hearth-fire. So died he the deed undone. See how Hephaestus succoured and saved the race of his son Erichthonius."[29]

The epigram, paraphrased by the lemmatist (27T4) and six times quoted from by the *Suda* (27T1a-f), seems a variant[30] of some prototype of a fable which occurs in the collections. This fable corresponds to the first half of the epigram: a snake devours a swallow's young.[31] In the fable collections the swallow makes a nest on a court house, which causes the mother to lament that she is wronged where men seek justice. Antipater's epigram does not specify the (crucial) place of the nest, but its second half does provide for the justice which the swallow was in vain seeking in the fable collections: the snake returns to devour the mother, too, but does not escape punishment.

The last one and a half verses sound like a gnomical epimythium, which expresses that the fable functions as an illustration (ἴδ' ὡς[32]) of divine retribution (Ἥφαιστος ἀμύντωρ).

27F2 Antip. Sid. 64 Gow-Page, *AP* 6.219: Gallus and Lion (*Aes.* 436)

"Goaded by the fury of the dreadful goddess, tossing his locks in wild frenzy, clothed in woman's raiment with well-plaited tresses and a dainty-netted hair-caul, a eunuch once took shelter in a mountain cavern, driven by the numbing snow of Zeus. But behind him rushed

---

[29] Translation by Paton 1917, II 119. The mythological references in the last line are explained by Gow-Page 1965, 84.

[30] See Van Dijk 1994a, 107, 109, 114 n. 70. Waltz (1906a, 36, n. 3) suggests that the epigram, included among the *epitaphia*, might be inspired by some picture (like Antip. Sid. 27F2).

[31] Babr. 118, *fab. aes.* 255 Hausrath, *Pa.Bodl.* 348 Chambry, *Syr.* LVI Lefèvre, *Tetr.* 1.56 (Adrados 1987a, 243-244).

[32] Commonly used in moralizing conclusions by Antipater (22 G-P, *AP* 7.172 (see the Appendix below).7; 55 G-P (*AP* 7.498).7; 27F2.23; 65 G-P (*AP* 12.97).4) and other epigrammatists, e.g. Call. 14 G-P (*ap.* Ath. 7.318B).6; Leon. 77 G-P (*AP* 7.472).9; Leon. (Alex.) *AP* 9.123.4, Honest. 3 G-P (*AP* 9.216).5, Phil. ib. 253.7, Arch. Mytil. ib. 339.5 (see below); Gow-Page 1965, II 51 (referring also to Leon. 23.3 and 90.1 G-P (*API* 307 and 182), Noss. 8 G-P (*AP* 6.353).1, and Tull. Gem. 5 G-P (*AP* 9.740).3, which are, however, less striking examples). Differently Holzberg (1993, 70): "keiner von ihnen [Antip. Sid. 27F1; Leon. 26F1; *AP* 6.217 ([Simon.]; see the Appendix below), 9.3 (Antip. Thess.), 9.86 (Antiphil.), 11.348 (Antiphan.)] gibt auch nur in Ansätzen ein *fabula docet*".

in unshivering a lion, slayer of bulls, returning to his den in the evening, who looking on the man, snuffing in his shapely nostrils the smell of human flesh, stood still on his sturdy feet, but rolling his eyes roared loudly from his greedy jaws. The cave, his den, thunders around him and the wooded peak that mounts nigh to the clouds echoes loud. But the priest startled by the deep voice felt all his stirred spirit broken in his breast. Yet he uttered from his lips the piercing shriek they use, and tossed his whirling locks, and holding up his great tambour, the revolving instrument of Olympian Rhea, he beat it, and it was the saviour of his life; for the lion hearing the unaccostumed hollow boom of the bull's hide was afraid and took to flight. See how all-wise necessity taught a means of escape from death!"[33]

This fable is a variation on (or rather: an elaboration[34] of) a theme—the unmanly behaviour of *galloi*[35] towards lions—dating back to Sumerian times[36] and treated in four other epigrams included in the same book of the *Anthologia Graeca*[37]. But, whereas the latter are dedicatory epigrams[38], the one under discussion is not[39]. The other four epigrams are about concrete dedications (allegedly) made by an emasculate priest to thank Cybele for his lucky escape from a frightful lion. As such, they are not obviously fictitious and metaphorical as fables typically are (see the Synthesis above). Antipater, however,

---

[33] Translation by Paton 1917, I 413, 415. The *Suda* (27T2a-h) quotes eight times from this epigram.

[34] This is not to endorse Gow-Page's disapproval (1965, II 84) of Antipater's version.

[35] To be connected with Sumerian *gala/kalû* (West 1969, 117), not with Latin *gallus* (Adrados 1987a, 310).

[36] West lc. Adrados (lc), comparing *fab. aes.* 84 and 292 Hausrath (Ach. Tat. 2.21 (see Delhay 1990; Van Dijk 1996a, 525-528); *Aes.* 82 and 259), however, connects the theme with "el del miedo del león al gallo" (cf. Lucr. 4.710-717; Plin. *NH* 8.19 (52), 10.21 (47); Plu. *Mor.* 537C, 981E; S.E. *P.* 1.58; Ael. *NA* 3.31, 6.22, 8.28, 14.9; Ar. Byz. *Epit.* 2.155; Hambroer, J., "Der Hahn als Löwenschreck im Mittelalter", *ZRGG* 18, 1966, 237-254), which is less to the point here (see previous note).

[37] [Simon.] 59 Page (2 Gow-Page), Alc. Mess. 21 Gow-Page, Diosc. 16 Gow-Page, Antist. 1 Gow-Page (*AP* 6.217-218, 220, 237), briefly compared by Gow 1960, 88-89; id.-Page 1965, II 24-25.

[38] *Lemm. ad* [Simon.] ἀνάθημα, Alc. Mess. 9 εἵσατο, Diosc. 16 ἀντίθεμαι, Antist. 1 θέτο.

[39] Gow-Page 1965, II 84: "the poem is therefore out of place in Bk 6"; cf. ib. 24-25; West 1969, 117. Differently Waltz 1906a, 36, n. 3: "explanatio picturae cujusdam". "Sin minus, ...in eo Anthologiae capite non reperiretur"; cf. Gow 1960, 88, referring to Varr. *Sat. Men.* 364 *ap.* Non. (p. 775 Lindsay).

does not have the eunuch make such a dedication. It is noteworthy that his epigram, unlike the other four[40], combines several typically fabulistic formal elements, three successively in its very first verse (ποτέ τις φρικτοῖο θεᾶς (*kenning*, like 7 ταυροφόνος θήρ[41])).

Not only the *incipit* of the fable but also its final stage (21 τότε[42]) and the epimythium (lacking altogether in the other four epigrams[43]) are formally marked (23 ἴδ' ὡς). The present epimythium is very much like that of Antipater's fable discussed above (27F1): apart from being introduced by the same formula, both are of equal length (one and a half verse), occupy the same metrical position (the last distich after the caesura κατὰ τὸν τρίτον τροχαῖον in the final hexameter), feature the metonymical use of the name of a god (27F1.7 Ἥφαιστος "fire" (referring to πυρός in the preceding verse), 27F2.24 Ἀΐδεω "death" (in opposition with 21 ζωᾶς)), and have a general application (in this case, something like our "Necessity is the mother of invention").

28. *Carpyllides*

28F1 Carpyllides 2 Gow-Page, *AP* 9.52: Man and Head (not in *Aes.*)

"A man, angling on the beach with a hook attached to a fine hair line, brought to shore the hairless head of a shipwrecked man. Pitying the bodiless corpse, he dug a little grave with his hands, having no tool, and found there hidden a treasure of gold. Of a truth then righteous men lose not the reward of piety."[44]

The anonymous protagonist (τις (*lemm.* 28T1 τινά); like in Antip. Sid. 27F2) is a typical character in fables. As in Antipater's epigrams (27F1-2), the last one and a half verse function as an epimythium[45],

[40] These have none or only one or two of these typical elements (for which see the Synthesis above): Alc. Mess. 1 τις, Diosc. 9 τότ', τινος.

[41] Cf. *Tetr.* 1.11.2, 1.32.2: θὴρ (...) λέων. [Simon.] 7 ὑλονόμος θὴρ is not a similar *kenning*, as the lion has already been introduced (4); the same goes for Alc. Mess. 5 ὠμηστέω θηρὸς in view of 3 λέων, as well as for Leon. 53 Gow-Page, *AP* 6.221(a related poem; see Gow-Page 1965, II 25, 361).7 †θὴρ...θὴρ νύκτιος† after 3 μουνολέων.

[42] Cf. e.g. Babr. 89.10; *fab. aes.* 53 II Hausrath; *Dod.* 73.10, 81.5 Chambry.

[43] These have, for all these reasons, been relegated to the Appendix below.

[44] Translation by Paton 1917, III 29. The lemmatist (28T1) gives a paraphrase.

[45] Weinreich 1951, 438-439, mentioning Latin, Italian, French and German imitations.

which interprets the fable as evidence (ἦ ῥα; cf. Arch. Antioch. 30F1) of justice recompensed (δικαίοις, εὐσεβίης, χάρις).

29. *Archias of Mytilene*[46]

29F1 Arch. Mytil.[47] 23 Gow-Page, *AP* 9.339: Crow and Scorpion (not in *Aes.*)

"Once upon a time, plying his black wings in the shining sky, a raven saw a scorpion dart up from underground. He swooped to catch it, but as he rushed down to earth it was quick to strike his foot with pointed dart; and so it robbed him of life. See how the doom he was making for another, from that other the poor creature himself received."[48]

The first line contains again the typically indefinite temporal adjunct ποτε (as in Leon. 26F1 and Antip. Sid. 27F2). The fable, summarized by the lemmatist (29T1), quoted and translated by Erasmus (29T2), does not occur in the collections. Its relation with the proverb κορώνη τὸν σκορπίον[49] is unclear.

The last one and a half verse are an epimythium, which presents the fable as an illustration (ἴδ' ὡς; the same introductory formula and metrical position as in Antip. Sid. 27F1-2) of being hoist with one's own petard[50].

30. *Archias of Antioch*[51]

30F1 Arch. Antioch. 24 Gow-Page, *AP* 9.343: Blackbird, Thrushes and Net (not in *Aes.*)

"A blackbird sank into the bosom of a net in the air, himself together

[46] Probably included in Meleager's *Garland*, not in Philip's; see Gow-Page 1968, II 435.

[47] On the ascription, see Reinach 1890, 30; Gow-Page 1968, II 432.

[48] Translation by Gow-Page 1968, I 415.

[49] Apostol. 9.99 (ἐπὶ τῶν ἑαυτοῖς λανθανόντως κακόν τι ἐπισπωμένων); Erasm. 29T2 (*in hos, qui parant eos lædere, unde tantundem mali sint vicissim accepturi*), ib. (*Adag.*) p. 987BC, comparing Κόραξ τὸν ὄφιν, *i.e.* Corvus serpentem. *Ubi quis suo ipsius invento perit. Sumtum ex Apologo quodam Æsopi.*

[50] Cf. Erasm. *id in rebus humanis frequenter usuvenire solet, ut qui cepisse videatur, ipse captus sit.*

[51] Probably included (like his namesake) in Meleager's *Garland*, not in Philip's; see above, n. 46.

with thrushes chased over a fence. These the cord gripped fast-held without escape; him alone it released again from the woven threads. Sacrosanct truly is the race of singers; even insensate traps have great regard for birds."[52]

This fable was imitated by Antipater of Thessalonica[53]. A numerical inversion may be observed between the two epigrams: Archias has the thrushes in the plural, the trap in the singular, whereas Antipater has the former in the singular and pluralizes the latter. Such variations are common both in fables[54] and in epigrams.

The last distich functions as an epimythium, which is again (as in Carpyllides 28F1) evidential (ἦ ἄρα) and *a minore*, though less pointedly[55].

Conclusion

A sharp distinction should be drawn between fables occurring in epigrams which are and are not included in the *Anthologia Graeca*: the latter have, the former lack a context; the latter's application is specific, the former's general (as with fables included in collections, and the *scolia* (6F1, 6A1)). The epigram from (Aristophanes') Aeschylus is in between, as its inclusion in the *Anthology* has entailed the loss of its original context.

The use of both Sophocles' allusion and Socrates' fable is remarkable, the latter in that it is a third-degree narration, each level having its own context and application, the former in that its protagonist stands in turn for the addressee and the narrator, who thus ingeniously combines self-defence with counterattack; furthermore, the allusion takes three of the fable's metaphors literally, whereas four ambiguities (χλιαίνων, ὡμίλησε, σπείρων, ἀπάγεις) turn the epi-

[52] Translation by Gow-Page 1968, I 415, 417.

[53] 80 Gow-Page, *AP* 9.76; Setti (1890, 94), conversely, ascribing (like Paton 1917, III 41; Law, H.H., "The Poems of Archias", *CPh* 31, 1936, 232; Waltz *et al.* (VII 30)) this epigram to the Sidonian Antipater, states that Archias (the Mytilenian according to Law (lc)) is the imitator; cf. Haupt, A., "Analecta", *Hermes* 3, 1868/1869, 207, adducing Cic. *Arch.* 18). The theme was also treated by Paul. Sil. *AP* 9.396; cf. Rhian. 10, *AP* 12.142, its "distant ancestor" (Gow-Page 1968, II 82).

[54] See Van Dijk 1994a, 104-105. Gow-Page (1968, II 446), not describing this inversion, deem it "an inferior version"; cf. Reinach 1890, 33, 37, 65.

[55] Gow-Page (1968, II 446-447) resist the temptation to replace πτανῶν with τήνων.

gram into a sexual innuendo. The authenticity of the three purportedly Classical epigrams is, however, questionable, to say the least.

Unlike the fable put into Socrates' (and Aesop's) mouth, which apparently had a promythium, nearly all fables from the *Anthology* have a gnomical epimythium, which fills the final distich or occupies its greater part; only Leonidas' fable has an internal clue for its evaluation instead (κάκιστε).

The theme of all but one of the Hellenistic fable epigrams is that justice will be done to wrongdoers (Leonidas, Antipater 27F1, Archias Mytil.) and benefactors (Carpyllides, Archias Antioch.) alike. One of Antipater's fables (27F2) broaches a different theme; the other one (27F2) typically provides a fable in which justice does *not* prevail with an ending in which it does.

CHAPTER EIGHT

HISTORIOGRAPHY[1]

Πρῶτον μὲν ἁπάντων χρὴ τὸν διδάσκαλον ἑκάστου γυμνάσματος εὖ ἔχοντα παραδείγματα ἐκ τῶν παλαιῶν συγγραμμάτων ἀναλεγόμενον προστάττειν τοῖς νέοις ἐκμανθάνειν, οἷον...μῦθου δὲ ὁποῖός ἐστι παρὰ Ἡροδότῳ τοῦ αὐλητοῦ, καὶ παρὰ Φιλίστῳ τοῦ ἵππου..., καὶ ἐν τῇ εἰκοστῇ Θεοπόμπου τῶν Φιλιππικῶν ὁ τοῦ πολέμου καὶ τῆς ὕβρεως... (Theon G20b)

31. *Herodotus*

31F1 Hdt. 1.141.1-2: Flute-Player and Fish (*Aes.* 11a)

In Herodotus' *Histories* one fable[2] occurs:

"Once...there was a flute-player who saw fishes in the sea and played upon his flute, thinking that so they would come out on to the land.[3] Being disappointed in his hope, he took a net and gathered in and drew out a great multitude of the fishes; and seeing them leaping, 'You had best,' said he, 'cease from your dancing now; you would not come out and dance then, when I played to you.'"[4]

The fable is demarcated from its context (1) by a terminological demarcation (λόγος; the fable is, however, *not* ascribed to Aesop, which is remarkable in that Herodotus elsewhere[5] does mention

---

[1] An earlier version of this chapter has appeared in *Bestia* 5 and 6 (Van Dijk 1993b and 1994b).

[2] Hart (1982, 73, 113), Hirsch (1985, *passim*) and Erbse (1992, 40-41) term it, less aptly, a "parable" (cf. Asheri (in: Asheri-Antelami 1988, 348): "parabola", although Antelami (ib. 161; rightly) translates "favola"); the same goes for Hohti's (1976, 19, 99): "comparison" and Huber's (L., *Religiose und politische Beweggrunde des Handelns in der Geschichtsschreibung des Herodots*, Diss. Tubingen: Prazis 1965, 96) "Ratselwort[es]". For 31T2 (Doxap.), see below, 32T2.

[3] Two passages from Ael. *NA*, present-tense descriptions of the alleged practice of catching sting-rays by means of dance and song (1.39) or flute-playing (17.18), may well be compared, but should not be considered to be allusions to Herodotus' fable (contra Grauert 1825, 10; Adrados 1987a, 40); cf. Jedrkiewicz 1989, 336, n. 5.

[4] Godley, A., *Herodotus*, I, Loeb, 1926[1] (repr. 1960), 181, translating λόγον both in 140.3 and 141.1 (see below) by "story".

[5] 2.134 (*Aes.* 13); this passage is not discussed by Stern, J., "Scapegoat Narratives in Herodotus", *Hermes* 119, 1991, 304-311, although Aesop dies as φάρμακος (but

Aesop as "fabulist" (λογοποιός)), (2) by the device of ring composition[6], and (3) by its presentation: its greater part is told in *accusativus cum infinitivo*, whereas the *réplique finale* uses *oratio recta*[7]. Herodotus' fable is the oldest extant in Greek prose and must somehow have been canonized, witness Theon (31T1; G20b), who includes "the fable of the flute-player by Herodotus...in his[8] first book" among four fables from classical historiographers, alluded to as examples worthy of imitation by pupils in their preparatory rhetorical exercises. The fable has ended up in the collections[9], but this is not to say that it has become proverbial[10].

Herodotus[11] has the fable told by Cyrus[12] to Ionian and Aeolian envoys. When the Greeks offer to obey Cyrus on the same conditions

---

not as a "misanthrope[s]"; contra Hubbard 1991, 75), according to Wiechers (1961, 31-42; cf. Handford, S.A., *JHS* 84, 1964, 205; but see the critical review by La Penna, *Helikon* 2, 1962, 698-699).

[6] 1 ἔλεξέ σφι λόγον ~ 3 τοῦτον τὸν λόγον...ἔλεξε ~ 4 ἔλεγέ σφι τάδε. Cf. Beck, I., *Die Ringkomposition bei Herodot und ihre Bedeutung für die Beweistechnik*, Hildesheim/New York: Olms, 1971, 11, n. 37; in general: Otterlo, W.A.A. van, "Untersuchungen über Begriff, Anwendung und Entstehung der griechischen Ringkomposition", Amsterdam 1944, 131-176; Immerwahr 1966, 54-58; Waters 1985, 62; Long 1987, 16-17.

[7] Cf. Hohti 1976, 19, 99; Adrados 1979a, 401; on Herodotus' dramatization in general, see Waters 1985, 63. For a stylistic analysis of Herodotus' fable, see Archibald 1902, pp. LXXXVIIIsq; 1912, 61-64. Kovacs' statement (1950, 22) that "the fable was cast into indirect discourse" is only partly correct.

[8] The textual problem is plausibly solved by Jacoby *ad* Philist. 33F1 (q.v.).

[9] Babr. 9, Aphth. 33, *fab. aes.* 11 Hausrath, *Syr.* 35 Lefèvre; differences described by Adrados 1987a, 40-41 (to which Leonardo Dati 13 could be added); Van Dijk 1994b, 120, n. 9.

[10] Contra Rutherford (1883, p. XXXIII, n. 2) on Zen. 1.72 and Aristaenet. *Ep.* 1.27 (cf. Diogenian. 2.19, Tim. *Lex.* 166, *Suda* α 1399 Adler, Greg. Cypr. 1.47 L, Macar. 1.92, Apostol. 2.31; cf. Tib. 1.5.67; Ruhnken, D., *Timaei sophistae lexicon vocum Platonicarum*, Leiden: Luchtmans 1789², 199), and Wienert (1925, 117) and Karadagli (1981, 23, n. 1) on *Ev. Mt.* 11.17 (cf. *Ev. Luc.* 7.32; Ehrhardt, A.A.T., "Greek Proverbs in the Gospel", *Harvard Theological Review* 46, 1953, 66-68), as well as contra Rutherford lc, Herrmann (1947/1948, 65-66), and Courtney (1993, 18) on Enn. *Sat.* fr. 65 Vahlen *ap.* Varr. *LL* 7.35, and Hirsch (1985, 225-226) on Philostr. *VA* 1.23; see Van Dijk 1994b, 120, n. 10.

[11] Some (Aly 1921, 53; Demandt 1991, 406; cf. Meuli 1954a, 744 and 1954b 728-729; Hart 1982, 73; Hirsch (1985, 223), pointing to Assyrian inscriptions "in which conquered peoples are captured like fish," and suggesting (ib. 226) "that the parable of the dancing fish had its origins in the Near East and represents the attitude of a land power, such as Persia, toward maritime peoples like the Greeks") speculate that Cyrus actually told the fable; contra: Erbse 1992, 40, 41 n. 13.

[12] Not Darius (contra Archibald 1912, 61; Nøjgaard 1964, 511).

on which they obeyed Croesus[13], whom Cyrus has just defeated [546 BC], the fable is his sole answer[14]. Cyrus is furious (ὀργῇ ἐχόμενος)[15], as the Ionians had not complied with previous requests of his to desert Croesus[16], but now that everything had been settled were ready to obey him. Cyrus' fury is particularly apparent from the double sarcasm[17] of the flute-player's *réplique finale*[18]: first, the flute-player *sees* (ἰδόντα[19]) the fish flounder (παλλομένους) but *says* (εἰπεῖν) that they dance (ὀρχεόμενοι), which is a grim sarcasm—not a euphemism—for their death agony[20]; secondly, he urges them to stop (Παύεσθε) dancing but no doubt knows that fish can do so only by dying.

Although neither Cyrus nor Herodotus[21] explain the meaning of the fable to their respective audiences, *casu quo* apply the fable to its context, it is clear in various ways that by the flute-player and the fish Cyrus metaphorically represents himself and the Greek envoys, respectively. The Greek envoys[22] will have realized that they had acted like the fish dancing to the fisherman's piping at the wrong time.[23]

---

[13] How-Wells (1928, I, *ad loc.*) explains: "The Ionians had paid tribute to the Lydians (27.1), and had their walls dismantled". Their situation is to deteriorate as they "now have to serve in war also (171.1)." Dressel (1876, 16) deduces that the fable originates in Lydia.

[14] Cf. Daly 1961a, 14; Schwarzbaum 1979, 110.

[15] Cf. Bornitz 1968, 188. Lang (M.L., *Herodotean Narrative and Discourse*, Cambridge, MA/London: Harvard UP 1984, 84) states that the flute-player is angry, too. Herodotus, however, does not say this explicitly. Avery, H., "Herodotus' Picture of Cyrus", *AJPh* 93, 1972, 543 observes that Cyrus is also angry in 1.114.3, 153.1-3 and 156.2 (τῆς ὀργῆς), and (ib. 537) also "speaks as a shrewd and wise man" in 1.153.1-2 and 155.1-2.

[16] Not Cyrus (contra Archibald lc).

[17] Cf. Archibald 1912, 63; Hart 1982, 83, 113 (although they do not elaborate this).

[18] Nøjgaard (1964, 73-74) quite absurdly infers that this "...présuppose directement que les poissons jetés sur la plage peuvent ne pas frétiller," i.e., there is an "action de choix [see above, Chapter I.I, 1.3]"; *ergo* this is a fable!

[19] This may be compared with the typical θεασάμενος, -σαμένη of the fable collections, for which see Karadagli 1981, 128-130; Holzberg 1993, 97.

[20] Crusius (1883, 239-240) compares Call. fr. 43 Schn. (326 Pfeiffer) *ap. Sudam*, Αι 137 Adler.

[21] Contra Adrados 1979a, 159: "Heródoto explica la intención de la fábula".

[22] That is, the Greeks of Asia Minor whom the envoys represent.

[23] Contra Erbse (1992, 41), who argues that the fable "rechtfertigt das Verhalten der kleinasiatischen Städte", and Dalfen (1994/1995, 168), who contends that the epimythium of the corresponding Aesopic fable (11 Hausrath: πρὸς τοὺς παρὰ καιρόν τι πράττοντας ὁ λόγος εὔκαιρος (I, likewise II and III)) "nicht mehr die Abfuhr [ist], die sich die Ionier und Aioler...von Kyros geholt haben."

Cyrus is speaking (ἔλεξε (*bis*), φάς) to them, like the flute-player (εἰπεῖν) to the fish; both in the fable and in its context there is a *single* speaker addressing a *larger* audience. Moreover, as the fable emphasizes the structural opposition between the elements of sea and land[24], the Greeks of Asia Minor as a sea power will naturally tend to identify themselves with the fish, and the king of the Persians, a land power, with the flute-player; besides, the draught of fishes appears to have been a common Near Eastern image for the subjection of enemies[25]. Herodotus, as an historiographer, can, and does, use an extra, literary, device, *in casu* two verbal parallels[26], to indicate the identification of the Greeks in the context with the fish in the fable. Therefore the Greek envoys can hardly take the flute-player's *réplique finale* to the floundering fish as anything else but Cyrus' answer to their previous proposals: they cannot but recognize that Cyrus, by means of the fable, turns down their request while at the same time showing them that they are now completely in his power.

Cyrus leaves the interpretation of the fable to his audience. That his message got across none the less is not[27] stated explicitly by Herodotus, but can be deduced from the Ionians'[28] reaction upon hearing their envoys' report: they prepared for war[29]. The Greeks' reaction is certainly not overdone, particularly in view of the grimly sarcastic *réplique finale* of Cyrus' fable. However, history—and its father, Herodotus—teaches us that their defense proved to be in vain: Harpagus subdued Ionia (1.162-169).

The fable is connected with its context at a somewhat higher level in several ways. First, the fable introduces a recurrent motif throughout the *Histories*, viz. the importance of sea power in the Graeco-

---

[24] ἰχθῦς ἐν τῇ θαλάττῃ, ἐξελεύσεσθαι ἐς γῆν; Hirsch 1985, 226.

[25] Hirsch (1985, 223-224) discusses nos. 80, 92, 99, 118 of Luckenbill, D.D., *Ancient Records of Assyria and Babylonia*, II, Chicago 1927; in one of these (no. 80) it is precisely a conquered Iamanean, i.e. a Ionian, who is compared to a caught fish.

[26] 1 (c.: Greeks) ἐθέλοντες, cf. 3 ἦσαν ἕτοιμοι ~ 2 (f.: fish) ἠθέλετε; 1 (c.: Greeks (envoys)) σφι ~ (f.: fish) σφεας ~ 3 (c.: Greeks) σφεας ~ 4 (c.: Greeks (envoys)) σφι.

[27] Contra Daly 1961a, 14.

[28] Except for the Milesians; only with them Cyrus did make a treaty on the same conditions as Croesus (4) and Alyattes (22.4; Bornitz 1968, 189; Asheri-Antelami 1988, 348); cf. How-Wells 1928, 118; Immerwahr 1966, 231; Hart 1982, 83.

[29] 4: they walled [περιεβάλοντο, the same verb as in the fable περιβαλεῖν about the fisherman's net] their cities, assembled in the Panionion and sent for assistance to Sparta; cf. Bornitz 1968, 189; Karadagli 1981, 23, 65-66. Archibald (1912, 64), however, asserts that "the Persuasiveness [of the fable]...is complete; the Ionians and Aeolians had no alternative but to abjectly submit."

Persian conflict.[30] Next, in the preceding chapter Herodotus explicitly marks (140.3) the structural transition[31] from his excursus(es) on Media and Persia (1.95-130; 131-140 (see below)) to his main theme: the rise of the Persian empire, thus linking 141 with 94 (the end of the Lydian *logos*). It is noteworthy that both the resumed main theme and the fable subsequently told are termed λόγος (both in the accusative case): Herodotus returns to his "story" (140.3 λόγον harking back to 95.1 λόγος) by telling a "story" (141.1 λόγον). Furthermore, the fable can thematically be connected with the two excursuses which surround it. The fable is preceded by an ethnographical excursus on the Persian νόμοι (131-140), which ends with a description of the Magi's habit of killing all kinds of animals ("ants, snakes, and the other reptiles and birds") except dogs[32] (140.3). This description thematically links up with the subsequent section, the chapter containing the fable and its immediate context, in that the animals (of the land and the sky in 140.3, of the sea in 141.2) share a cruel fate, whereas one group (the dogs (140.3 πλὴν κυνὸς) and the Milesians (141.4 πλὴν Μιλησίων), respectively) is in an exceptional position. After 141 Herodotus immediately interrupts the main theme which he has just returned to in another excursus concerning the Ionians (142-150). The fable is thematically connected with this excursus, too, viz. by the prompt reappearance of the motif of the contrast between the Greeks as a sea power and the Persians as a land power.[33] Thus the function of the fable might also be called compositionally unifying: it helps to tie together the two digressions framing it and the central theme of the *Histories*.

[30] See, besides Hirsch 1985, the excursus in Shimron 1989, 89-92. This is in accordance with one of the conclusions of Long's study on Herodotus' short stories (1987, 176): "They...point out a theme which will shape the larger narrative." Neither Shimron nor Long, however, mention the fable (nor does Konstan, D., "The Stories in Herodotus' *Histories*: Book I", *Helios* 10, 1983, 1-22).

[31] See Immerwahr 1966, 89; Wood, H., *The Histories of Herodotus. An Analysis of the Formal Structure*, 's-Gravenhage/Paris: Mouton 1972, 22, 33, 48; Cagnazzi, S., "Tavola dei 28 Logoi di Erodoto", *Hermes* 103, 1975, 389-391; cf. Hohti 1976, 19, 99; differently the genetic analysis by Powell, J.E., *The History of Herodotus*, Cambridge: UP 1939 (repr. Amsterdam: Hakkert 1967), 9-10.

[32] See How-Wells 1928 and Asheri-Antelami 1988 *ad loc.*

[33] 143.1 τοῖσι δὲ αὐτῶν νησιώτῃσι ἦν δεινὸν οὐδέν·...οὔτε αὐτοὶ οἱ Πέρσαι ναυβάται.

32. *Thucydides*

Despite two curious allegations to the contrary, one from Antiquity, one from the Byzantine Age, no fables occur in Thucydides' *Peloponnesian War*. First, a scholiast (32T1), commenting upon the introduction to Pagondas' speech to the Boeotians[34] (4.92), derives the passage "from Aesop's fables" and (mis[35])quotes a Babrian *réplique finale*[36], to show that the historiographer alludes to the fable of the Hare who outran a Dog; the latter explained to a mocking goatherd, in mitigation of his loss of face, that the pursued runs for his life but the pursuer does not. With this fable the Thucydidean passage is at best[37] *comparable*, in that Pagondas points out to his troops that men defending their own country (must) fight differently from (less prudently than) those attacking it; however, the text contains no explicit reference to the fable—not to mention a problematic anachronism, the historiographer predating the fabulist, whose version is the only one extant[38], by some five centuries at least.

Yet more curious is a Byzantine passage. Doxapatres (32T2), commenting upon Aphthonius' ascription (G54) of the genre's (that is, the fable's) origin to "the poets", notes that prosaists used μῦθοι too. So far, so good. The Byzantine commentator's exemplifications are, however, remarkable: "Herodotus often [cf. 31T3 (Σ *in* Aphth.)], Thucydides rarely, e.g. that of the nightingale, and some others". One might be inclined to think that Doxapatres hereby, as elsewhere (e.g. ibid. p. 149 Walz) and like already Hermogenes (2T9), alludes to *Hesiod*'s Nightingale fable (2F1), which is often adduced in rhetorical treatises on the genre as its oldest extant specimen. However, the only ἀηδών[39] occurring in Thucydides' *History* is the one into which

---

[34] See e.g. Harding, H.F., *The Speeches of Thucydides*, Lawrence, Kansas: Coronado P 1973, 194-196.

[35] Converting the first choliamb into a iambic trimeter; cf. Luzzatto-La Penna *in app. crit.*

[36] Babr. 69 (*Aes.* 331; Adrados 1987a, 352). 5-6; cf. Du Méril 1854, 33, n. 7; contra Dressel 1876, 28.

[37] However, the passage is rather comparable with 1.86.4 (Classen, J.-Steup, J., *Thukydides*, IV, Berlin/Zürich/Dublin: Weidmann 1966[5] (= 1900[3]), 182, referring to Bloomfield).

[38] I do not believe that this fable is alluded to in Ar. *Ra.* 191 or *V.* 375-376 (see the Appendix below).

[39] Bétant, E.-A., *Lexicon Thucydideum*, I, Genève 1843 (repr. Hildesheim: Olms 1961) sv; Essen, M.H.N. von, *Index Thucydideus ex Bekkeri editione stereotypa*, Berlin: Weidmann 1882, ibid.

Procne was metamorphosed (2.29.2[40]). Ergo, μῦθος in the commentary is not synonymous with μῦθος in the passage commented upon, meaning "fable" in the latter, "myth"[41] in the former.

33. *Philistus*

33F1 Philist. *FGrHist*556F6 *ap.* Theon. *Prog.* 2: Horse (, Stag/Swine and Man/Hunter (*Aes.* 269(a))?)

Theon[42] (33T1; G20b) includes "the fable of the Horse by Philistus (...) in his second book"[43] among the four exemplary fables mentioned above (Hdt. 31F1). Although Philistus' fable is not extant, the hypothesis that Theon hereby alludes to the fable of the Horse, the Stag (or Swine), and the Man (or Hunter), which, according to Aristotle (7T1) and Conon (7T2), Stesichorus (7F2) told to the Himeraeans to dissuade them from giving Phalaris a bodyguard, is plausible, as Theon's testimony, notably its book number, implies that the fable occurred in the first part (σύνταξις), which described the early history (roughly up to the end of the fifth century BC)[44], of the Syracusan historiographer's *History of Sicily*, on which island Stesichorus' fable is traditionally set; this assumption is *communis opinio*[45], but it has

[40] Cf. Σ *ad loc.* σημείωσαι ὅτι ἐνταῦθα μόνον μῦθον εἰσάγει ἐν τῇ συγγραφῇ; Gomme, A.W., *A Historical Commentary on Thucydides*, II, Oxford: Clarendon P 1956, 90.

[41] It should be noted that Procne's mythical metamorphosis into a nightingale is alluded to in a fable (*Aes.* 277): Babr. 12 (cf. Perry 1965, 18-21, n. a), *Pa.Bodl.* 9 Chambry (Adrados 1987a, 62).

[42] Not Themistius (contra Adrados 1983a, 59).

[43] Translation in accordance with Jacoby's emendation (*ad loc.*; q.v.) and Butts' interpretation (1987, 168) of the text. Bergk (T., *Poetae Lyrici Graeci*, III[4], Leipzig: Teubner 1882, 233), however, conjectured τῶν (Ἱμεραίων παρ') ἑκατέρῳ, "sed verisimilius bina exempla ex Philisto allata esse, qui fabulam de Himeraeis et equo libro I, apologum τῶν † ἐνεκατέρων libri II inseruit." Contra (rightly): Columba (referred to by Rizzo 1895, 38, n. 2).

[44] Cf. Von Christ-Schmid-Stahlin 1912, 525; Laqueur, R., "Philistos" (3), *RE* 19.2, Stuttgart: Metzler 1938, col. 2417; Ziegler, K., "Philistos", *DKP* 4, col. 757: "Die ersten 7 B[ucher]. führten bis zum Fall von Akragas 405 [BC]"; Sordi, M., "Filisto e la propaganda dionisiana", in: Verdin-Schepens-De Keyser 1990, 159, n. 1.

[45] Thus Thiele 1908, 379-380; Hausrath 1938, col. 1487; Nøjgaard 1963, 15; Karadagli 1981, 15; Adrados 1987a, 229-231; Jedrkiewicz 1989, 416.

to be allowed for that the horse's antagonist(s) in Philistus' and Stesichorus' fables were *not* identical[46].

34. *Aristotle*[47]

34F/A1 Arist. fr. 573 Rose *ap.* Σ *in* Ar. *Av.* 471: unknown (*Aes.* T5)

Scholia (34T1-2) on a fable by Aristophanes (17F6) report that "Aristotle in his *Constitution of the Samians* said that Aesop by telling a[48] fable became popular." As the quondam context of this fragment has not been preserved, it cannot be ascertained *which* fable Aristotle ascribed to Aesop; nor is it possible to say whether Aristotle told Aesop's fable at length or only alluded to it. The above fragment only justifies the deduction that the Aristotelian Aesop's fable was successful. One can, though, usefully compare two other passages from Aristotle: the reference to Aesop's violent death in the lost *Constitution of the Delphians*[49], and the fable of the Fox, the Ticks and the Hedgehog (*Aes.* 427), which Aristotle in his *Rhetoric* (39F2) reports Aesop told in a public assembly on Samos. A juxtaposition of the latter passage and the fragment under consideration does not prove that the two fables were identical[50], but the two passages do corroborate the scholiast's testimony that Aristotle presented Aesop as the narrator of a fable on Samos in a political[51] context (probably in the 6th century BC[52]).

---

[46] Therefore, the reproduction of the text of Theon's testimony by Peter, H., *Historicorum Romanorum Reliquiae*, I, Leipzig: Teubner 1906, 76: ...καὶ παρὰ Φιλίστῳ τοῦ ἵππου καὶ ⟨τοῦ ἐλάφου⟩ παρ' ἑκατέρῳ, is both misleading and inaccurate. Butts (1986, 167), however, not mentioning the common geographical background of Philistus' and Stesichorus' horse fables, seems overcautious.

[47] See also below, Arist. 39F1-2, 52A1, 57F1, 57A1-2.

[48] μῦθον (singular); not fables in general (contra Sarkady 1968, 8-9).

[49] Fr. 487 Rose *ap.* Zen. *s.* τὸ Αἰσώπειον αἷμα, p. 369 Miller; see above, Chapter I.III, 4.1, n. 131.

[50] Contra Welcker 1845, 248; Rose *ad loc.*; cf. Perry 1952, 216: "fortasse"; Sarkady 1968, 9 (rightly) contra Melella, O., "Esopo y la fábula esópica", *Anales de Literaturas Clásicas* 3, 1945-1946, 291, 315.

[51] Aristotle's mention of Aesop just in a *Πολιτεία* seems to point to this (Sarkady 1968, 9-10); cf. Arist. *Rh.* lc.

[52] Testimonies listed by Perry, 1952, T 8-12 and compared by Sarkady 1968, 10.

35. *Theopompus*

35F1 Theopomp. Hist. *FGrHist*115F127 *ap.* Theon. *Prog.* 2: War and Insolence (*Aes.* 367)

Among the four examples of fables which pupils should memorize, Theon (35T1; G20b) includes besides Herodotus' and Philistus' fables (31F1, 33F1) also "that of War and Insolence in the twentieth book of Theopompus' *History of Philip.*"[53] Theopompus' fable is not extant, but a fable with the same protagonists is, viz. an aetiological fable[54] by Babrius[55], explaining why insolence is always followed by war: when the gods were paired off, War married Insolence, because he was the last to choose a partner and she was the only one still unengaged; the passion which he conceived for her was so extraordinary that he follows her ever since. The assumption that Theopompus' fable was somehow comparable[56] with Babrius' seems plausible, although it is impossible to say to what extent[57].

Theon adds an indication of the lost context of Theopompus' fable by transmitting both its narrator and the addressee: "Philip [II of Macedonia; 359-336 BC] tells it to the plenipotentiaries of the Chalcidians", that is, just as in Herodotus' fable (31F1), an enemy king to Greek envoys. Theon also adds the book number, which is (as in

[53] The same chapter contains yet another quotation from the *Philippica* (115F153), for which see Connor, W.R., *Theopompus and Fifth-Century Athens*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP 1968, 78sqq.

[54] Wienert (1925, 36), however, classes it among the "mythologisch-ätiologische Mythen [cf. Schranz 1912, 55, n. 4; Flower 1994, 124] und Sagen", whereas Nøjgaard (1964, 118) calls it a "personnification," which he (like Liebchen; above, Chapter I.I, 2.13) considers to be a literary genre, which it is not: personification is only a matter of characters, common in allegory, but occasionally, as here, also occurring in fables (e.g. Truth and Falsehood: Babr. 126 = *Aes.* 355; Phaedr. *App.* 5-6 = *Aes.* 535; see Komornicka 1987). Besides, War and Insolence may perhaps be understood better as gods than as "personificazioni" (contra Jedrkiewicz 1989, 416); cf. the *incipit* of Babrius' fable: Θεῶν γαμούντων.

[55] 70, *Pa.Bodl.* 320 Chambry (*Aes.* 367). Adrados (1979a, 420; 1987a, 394) suggests that the theme of War married with Insolence derives from Ar. *Pax* 236sqq.

[56] Crusius 1895a. Adrados (1987a, 394), however, mentions neither Theon nor Theopompus.

[57] Nevertheless, Jacoby *ad loc.* prints Babr. 70 without comment, while Crusius (1895a) called the Babrian aetiology "eine unverkennbare Paraphrase dieser—natürlich von dem Historiker fingierten—Allegorie". Butts (1987, 168) shows more caution, considering the fables to be "perhaps the same". It may be noted that Crusius' use of the term "Allegorie"—like Jedrkiewicz's (1989, 416)—is confusing: it should be reserved for the literary genre in which the image *as a whole* corresponds to something else (cf. Dithmar (above, Chapter I.I, 2.5)).

Philist. 33F1) an important clue: as Books 22-24 (115F137-151) dealt with the Olynthian War (349/8 BC), Theopompus is likely to have had Philip tell the fable (which according to Theon was in Book 20) to the Chalcidians *before* the war actually broke out, possibly in 352/1 BC[58], during Philip's negotiations with the Chalcidian League after the Olynthians had made a peace treaty with Athens, thus breaking a clause of their alliance with Philip dating from 357 BC (cf. D. 23.107-109). The use of the fable may have been part of Philip's diplomacy before turning to military action, persuading his neighbouring allies and at the same time threatening those responsible.[59] He may have explained their representatives that war was inevitable after this insolent breach of faith.

To assume that Theopompus had Philip tell an aetiological fable to the Chalcidians by which he represented the war as following from, i.e. provoked by, some insolence of theirs seems to be in accordance with the historiographer's portrait[60] of the Macedonian king. Besides, the theme of War inextricably bound with Insolence fits in well with the aversion to war which other fragments from Theopompus' *History of Philip* display[61].

[58] Cf. Laqueur, R., "Theopompos", *RE* 5.2, Stuttgart 1934, col. 2216; Jacoby (*ad loc.*), however, places the fable one year later, Schranz (1912, 55) Book 20 two years.

[59] See Hammond, N.G.L.-Griffith, G.T., *A History of Macedonia*, II: *550-336 B.C.*, Oxford: Clarendon P 1979, 299, connecting this (referring to D. 9.56+66, [D.] 59.91, as well as to Zahrnt, M., *Olynth und die Chalkidier*, Munchen 1971, 110) with "the exile of Apollonides and a temporary eclipse of the anti-Macedonian faction"; Flower 1994, 124 (whose reconstruction is, however, somewhat overconfident).

[60] One should not deduce (contra Von Christ-Schmid-Stahlin 1912, 532-533; cf. Lesky 1971, 698-699) from Plb. 8.11-13 (*FGrHist* 115T19; cf. Theon, *Prog.* 2 and 8 (*Φιλίππου ἐγκώμιον*, *FGrHist* 115F255-256)) that Theopompus held Philip in great admiration; see Connor, W.R., "History without Heroes: Theopompus' Treatment of Philip of Macedon", *GRBS* 8, 1967, 133-154; Walbank, F.W., *A Historical Commentary on Polybius*, II, Oxford: Clarendon P 1967, 80; Breitenbach, H.R., "Theopompos (6.)", *DKP* 5, col. 730; Shrimpton 1977; Alonso-Núñez, J.M., "The Emergence of Universal Historiography from the 4th to 2nd Centuries B.C.", in: Verdin-Schepens-De Keyser 1990, 179; Flower 1994, 98. Clem. Al.'s criticism (*Strom.* 1.1.2 (p. 3 Stahlin)) of Theopompus' use of μῦθοι is unlikely to refer to fables.

[61] *FGrHist* 115FF67-69, 380, on which see Shrimpton 1977, 129, n. 13, with further literature.

36. *Aristobulus*

36F1 Aristobul. *FGrHist*139F3 *ap.* Plu. *Dem.* 23.5: Sheep, Dogs and Wolves (*Aes.* 153)

Witness Plutarch (36T1), Aristobulus put[62] the fable of the Sheep, who surrendered the Dogs to the Wolves, into Demosthenes' mouth (40F1; see the next Chapter).

37. *Hieronymus Cardianus*

37T1 D.S. 19.25.5-6: Lion, Maiden and Her Father (*Aes.* 140)?

As books XVIII-XX of Diodorus' *Library* go back to, and abbreviate, Hieronymus of Cardia[63], the fable which the former (38F1 = 37T1?) has Eumenes, Hieronymus' townsman, tell possibly[64] occurred also in the latter's lost historiographical work on the Wars of the Successors.[65]

38. *Diodorus Siculus*

38F1 D.S. 19.25.5-6: Lion, Maiden and Her Father (*Aes.* 140)

In Diodorus' *Library* two fables occur. The first one runs as follows:

"A lion, having fallen in love with a maiden, spoke to the girl's father about marriage. The father said that he was ready to give her to him, but that he was afraid of the lion's claws and teeth, fearing that after he had married her he might lose his temper about something and turn on the maiden in the manner of a beast. When, however, the lion had pulled out his claws and his teeth, the father,

[62] Cf. Drerup 1923, 25-26 contra Baiter-Sauppe *ad* D. fr. 12-13.

[63] Brown, T.R., "Hieronymus of Cardia", *AHR* 52, 1946-1947, 692; Simpson, R.H., "Abbreviation of Hieronymus in Diodorus", *AJPh* 80, 1959, 370-379; Rosen, K., "Political Documents in Hieronymus of Cardia (323-302 B.C.)", *AClass* 10, 1967, 41-94; Stiewe, K., "Hieronymos (6)", *DKP* 2, col. 1137; Hornblower, J., *Hieronymus of Cardia*, Oxford: UP 1981, 32-34; Lehmann, G.A., discussion in: Verdin-Schepens-De Keyser 1990, 302; Sacks, K.S., *Diodorus Siculus and the First Century*, Princeton, NJ: UP 1990, 41, n. 76.

[64] Schwarzbaum (1979, pp. VIIIsq) misrepresents this possibility as a fact.

[65] Jacoby, F., "Hieronymos (10)", *RE* VIII.2, Stuttgart 1913, col. 1558-1559.

perceiving that the lion had thrown away everything which had made him formidable, killed him easily by beating him with a club."[66]

The fable[67] is clearly demarcated from its context by terminology—it is termed a λόγος (4)—and presentation: the fable proper and the epimythium are entirely told in the *accusativus cum infinitivo* (both the terminological demarcation and the *accusativi cum infinitivis* depending on *verba dicendi* (4 εἶπε, 5 ἔφη, respectively)). Stylistically, *variatio* (5 παρθένου—κόρης—παρθένῳ) contrasts with *repetitio* (5-6 τοὺς ὄνυχας καὶ τοὺς ὀδόντας *bis*). Diodorus' fable contains a humorous touch based upon a word-play: the father fears that the lion will treat his daughter "in the manner of a beast" (θηριωδῶς[68]), but how could an animal behave otherwise? The pun is rather tragicomical, for the lion meets with his death after having naïvely removed his supposed future father-in-law's objections, which he took seriously. The composition of the fable is climactic in that it closes with the lion's end, ἀποκτεῖναι being the very last word. It is noteworthy that, whereas Diodorus' version of the fable is the oldest one extant, the historiographer calls it "traditional" and "old"[69]. The death of the protagonist is a typical *action finale*[70]; in some other versions of the fable, however, the lion escapes by the skin of his teeth.[71]

Diodorus has the fable told by Eumenes to satraps and Macedonians, units of his army which Antigonus, the enemy commander, had in vain tried to seduce to desertion by fair promises (317 BC). The relation of the fable to its context is made clear by both the historiographer and the narrator to their respective audiences; it is apparent from the very text in the following way. First, the historiographer

---

[66] Translation by Geer 1947, 297-299.

[67] Denis (1883, 301-302) (groundlessly) calls this fable Oriental, Fusci (1901, 43, n. 2) "libica".

[68] Cf. Hes. 2T30c (Eust.; quoted above, Hes. 2F1, n. 53).

[69] 4 λόγον...τῶν παραδεδομένων μὲν καὶ παλαιῶν. Karadagli (1981, 32) prefers to translate the first adjective by "abgenutzt", Geer (1947, 297) the second one by "time-worn".

[70] See Nøjgaard 1964, 153: "l'action finale absolue" (above, Chapter I.I, 1.3); cf. the Synthesis.

[71] In *fab. aes.* 145 Hausrath, *Dod.* 199 Chambry, and *Syr.* 36 Lefèvre, the lion is just driven away (cf. Niceph. Basil. *Prog.* 1.3 (pp. 74-75 Pignani)). In Babr. 98, Aphth. 7, *Pa.Bodl.* 199 Chambry, and Georg. Pach. *Prog.* 1 (I 551-552 Walz) the lion meets with the same fate as in Diodorus; cf. Adrados, 1987a, 154-155 (incomplete). The end of the version alluded to by Sopat. Rh. G58 is unclear.

markedly (by a litotes) announces that the fable is very similar to its context (4 οὐκ ἀνοίκειον...τῆς περιστάσεως); then, the narrator, Eumenes, adds an epimythium explaining the analogy between the fable and its context: he explicitly states that Antigonus behaves in almost the same way (6 τὸ παραπλήσιον [cf. Theon, G20c] οὖν ποιεῖν καὶ τὸν Ἀντίγονον), viz. as the girl's father, the last subject mentioned in the fable; that Antigonus and the girl's father behave similarly is indicated by the historiographer also by means of a verbal parallel: both Antigonus and the father promise "to give"[72]; this identification solves the other unknowns of the equation: Antigonus makes fair promises to Eumenes' men, the father pledges his daughter to the lion—ergo: Eumenes' men are compared to the lion, Antigonus' fair promises (land, honourable repatriation, retention of possessions and posts (3)) to the maiden.

The function of the fable is explicitly indicated by the historiographer: the fable serves as a motivation of Eumenes' eulogy on his men[73]; they are praiseworthy because they did *not* act like the lion who believed that the promises made would be kept. At the same time, by the fable Eumenes illustrates that the acceptance of Antigonus' offers, though attractive at first sight (the lion fell in love with the maiden), would have involved peril to their lives: *if* the leaders (τοὺς ἀφηγουμένους) had placed the army (τῆς δυνάμεως) in Antigonus' power (κυριεύσῃ), they would have met with the same fatal punishment (κολάσῃ) as the clawless and toothless lion who was easily clubbed to death. It might be remarked that, supposing that more variants of this fable existed already in the time of Diodorus—who has been seen above to call the fable "traditional" and "old"—the selection of precisely this variant is understandable, for the variant ending referred to above (the lion saving his skin) would have appealed far less to the soldiers' imagination.

At first sight, one might wonder that Eumenes in his epimythium confines himself to the *leaders'* punishment, but it should be noted that, whereas Antigonus had sent envoys to *two* groups, viz. the satraps and the Macedonians (2 πρός τε τοὺς σατράπας καὶ τοὺς

[72] c. 3 δώσειν (Antigonus) ~ f. 5 δοῦναι (Father); the future of 3 δώσειν is circumscribed by 5 ἕτοιμος...ἐστιν. Cf. c. 2 πρεσβευτὰς ἐξαπέστειλε (Antigonus to Eumenes' men) ~ f. 5 διαλεχθῆναι (Father to Lion).

[73] 4: ...Εὐμενὴς παρελθὼν ἐπῄνεσέν τε αὐτοὺς καὶ λόγον εἶπε..., which might be taken as a hendiadys: Eumenes illustrated his praise by telling a fable.

Μακεδόνας), only the latter are *expressis verbis* said to decline Antigonus' offers (4 τῶν δὲ Μακεδόνων); in other words, the *satraps*' attitude is not clear from Diodorus' text, so that it makes sense for Eumenes to dissuade particularly *them* from any possible inclination towards desertion, in order to keep his ranks closed. Still, although they acted more wisely than the lion, it is flattering for his soldiers to be compared to a *lion*; moreover, Eumenes adroitly emphasizes that the lion frightens[74] the father, thus keeping up *esprit de corps* by insinuating that Antigonus is terrified of them.

Diodorus explicitly reports the reaction of Eumenes' audience to the fable: the host applauded approvingly[75]; thereupon "he dismissed the assembly".

38F2 D.S. 33.7.6: Middle-Aged Man and Two Women (*Aes.* 31)

Diodorus' second fable reads thus:

"There was...a certain middle-aged man who took two wives[76]. The younger, eager to have her husband resemble her, pulled out his grey hairs, while the old woman pulled out the black ones, until between them he was soon left quite bald."[77]

Diodorus' second fable, which has ended up in the collections[78], is demarcated from its context in nearly the same way as the first (38F1): by terminology—it is termed an αἶνος (5)—and presentation: both the fable proper and the epimythium are entirely told in the *accusativus cum infinitivo* (both the terminological demarcation and the *accusativi cum infinitivis* again depending on *verba dicendi* (5 διελθὼν, 6 ἔφη (as in 38F1), respectively)). Furthermore, the very first word of the fable proper is the typically unspecified protagonist (τινα; see the Synthesis above).

---

[74] 5 δεδοικέναι; 6 ἦν φοβερός. In the other versions (Babr. 98.6-9, *fab. aes.* 145 Hausrath; Aphth. 7.6; *Pa.Bodl.* 199 Chambry; *Dod.* ibid.13; from *Syr.* 36 it is not clear *who* is afraid of the lion) the father says that the lion terrifies his daughter; cf. Lens Tuero's observation (1985, 7).

[75] 7 ὡς ὀρθῶς λέγοντος; καὶ, Capps' conjecture (for ὡς) adopted by Geer (1947, 298), does not appear to be an emendation *stricto sensu*. Cf. Karadagli 1981, 32.

[76] Not: "prostitutas" (contra Adrados 1979a, 537, 547).

[77] The translations in this section are by Walton, F.R., *Diodorus of Sicily*, XII, Loeb, 1967, 23.

[78] Phaedr. 2.2; Babr. 22; *fab. aes.* 31 Hausrath; *Pa.Bodl.* 52 Chambry; *Dod.* ibid.; *Tetr.* 1.54; Doxap. 2.159, 172, 189 Walz; anon. *in* Aphth. (II 12 Walz); Dati 21; Lens Tuero, J., "Viriato, héroe y rey cínico", *EFG* 2, 1986, 261-263 (kindly sent to me by the author—from Granada to Madrid); Adrados 1987a, 56-57 (incomplete).

Diodorus has Viriathus, the leader of the Lusitanians (147-139 BC), tell it to the people of Tucca, who now sided with the Romans, now with him (5). The narrator again adds an epimythium in which he explains the relation between the fable and its context: "as the Romans put to death those who were at odds with them and the Lusitanians did away with their enemies, the city would soon be left empty." The relation between fable and context, more particularly the analogy between the man and the Tuccans is made unquestionably clear by (1) the introductory formula of the epimythium, by which Viriathus explicitly states that the Tuccans' fate will be similar (τὸ παραπλήσιον δὲ καὶ [like in the first fable]...ἔσεσθαι), viz. to that of the man going bald, the subject last mentioned, and (2) a verbal parallel underlining and elaborating this analogy: their dreadful fate will "soon"[79] become reality (it is not some vague prospect).

The fable functions on two levels. On both levels its function is made explicit. The narrator proper, Viriathus, tells the fable to deride (5 ἔσκωψεν) and at the same time rebuke (5 ἐπέπληξεν) the instability of the people of Tucca. The image of the man being plucked bald by two wives unquestionably conveys mockery, nor is the prospect of his fate likely to have attracted the wavering villagers. At the same time, the criticism and scoffing of Viriathus' fable is slightly, but tactfully, mitigated by the very sex of the fable characters: the village people are compared to an eligible *man* (cf. the frightening lion of Diodorus' other fable (38F1)), the outsiders to dishonourably acting *women*. On a somewhat higher level, the historiographer brings up the fable as an exemplification of Viriathus' straightforwardness and ready wit in conversation.[80]

Viriathus' fable is evaluated on the second level, whereas on the first it is not: it is not related how the people of Tucca reacted to the fable, but Diodorus expresses his appreciation.[81]

Conclusion

Some caution is needed as the identification of some fables is more or less problematic. Of Theopompus' fable only the two antagonists are

[79] ταχὺ *bis*: f. (Man)—c. (Tuccans).

[80] 5 ἦν δὲ οὗτος [*sc.* ὁ Ὑρίατθος] κατὰ τὰς ὁμιλίας εὔστοχος, ὡς ἂν ἐξ αὐτοδιδάκτου καὶ ἀδιαστρόφου φύσεως φέρων τοὺς λόγους. καὶ γάρ... 7 πολλὰ δὲ καὶ ἕτερά φασιν αὐτὸν ἐν βραχέσιν ἀποφθέγξασθαι,...

[81] 5 οὐκ ἀσόφως (again a litotes; cf. οὐκ ἀνοίκειον before the first fable).

known, of Philistus' only one, and of Aristotle's nothing at all. Hieronymus' work may have contained a fable, but Thucydides' does not (in spite of suggestions to the contrary). Moreover, the major clues for the hypothetical reconstruction of the quondam contexts of most of these fables are mere book titles (Philistus, Aristotle) or summary paraphrases (Theopompus).

Yet it is strikingly clear that all fables occurring in Historiographical Prose[82] are part of, or even constitute, a speech delivered by a leader to a larger audience, whether an enemy king to Greek envoys (Herodotus, Theopompus), a commander to his men (Diodorus *bis*), or an orator to Greek citizens (Philistus (?), Aristotle (?), Aristobulus); compare Herodotus' very fable about one flute-player addressing a school of fish. This is precisely the use of fables recommended in Aristotle's *Rhetoric* (G5) and (in advance of the next Chapter's Conclusion) applied in Oratorical Prose.[83] Therefore, the historiographers' use of fables may be said to fit into the generally rhetorical character of ancient historiography.

Accordingly, two levels should be distinguished, viz. the narrator's and the historiographer's, each having his own audience, the former (allegedly) narrating the fable orally in a (more or less remote) historical past, the latter in writing in (the contemporary) present.

Three fables (Herodotus', Philistus', Theopompus') have (along with Xenophon's (50F1)) apparently been canonized, witness Theon's selection of them for educational ends (G20b).

The function of the fables in their contexts may best be studied in Herodotus and Diodorus. The exact relation between the fable and its context is more explicit in Diodorus than in Herodotus, as the former adds an epimythium to his fables. Herodotus, however, does (like Diodorus) indicate the analogy between the fable and its context to his audience by means of verbal parallels; from the reaction of Cyrus' audience it is clear that the point of the fable, which conveys grim sarcasm, did not elude them either. On a higher level, Herodotus' fable has an additional structural function; one of Diodorus' fables (38F2) has an illustrative function on a somewhat higher level, too.

---

[82] This applies to ancient Graeco-Roman historiography *in toto*; see Van Dijk 1993b, 1994b.

[83] Cf. Van Dijk 1994b, 135, n. 193.

The fable characters, *casu quo* the fables, selected by Herodotus and Diodorus are appropriate in their respective contexts. Cyrus intimidates his audience by comparing them to fish netted by a fisherman, raising the spectre of Greek naval power subdued by Persian land power; conversely, Eumenes and Viriathus flatter their audiences by comparing them to a frightening lion and an eligible man, respectively.

Both of the fables by Diodorus are remarkably similar, both as regards the devices by which the fable is demarcated from, and connected with, its context and as regards their theme (both—apparently like Theopompus' fable—deal with marriage[84]). One has an explanatory function, the other is both comical and persuasive (the former function diplomatically mitigating the latter). As for their reception, the first fable (like Aristotle's) meets with the audience's approval, the second with the historiographer's.

Apparently, two aetiological fables are used to quite different ends, which once again testifies to the genre's versatility. Theopompus may have employed one as a threat (cf. Arist. 57F1), whereas Philistus' specimen may have had the same persuasive function as Stesichorus' (7F2).

[84] 38F1 γάμου, γῆμας; 38F2 γαμῆσαι; cf. Babr. 70.1 γαμούντων, ib.3 γῆμας.

ORATORY & RHETORIC

'Ο μῦθος...γεγένηται δὲ καὶ ῥητόρων κοινὸς ἐκ παραινέσεως.
(Aphth. G54)

39. *Aristotle*[1]

39F1 Arist. *Rh.* 2.20, 1393b8-22: Horse, Stag, Man (*Aes.* 269a)

The fable of the Horse, the Stag and the Man functions on two levels: the narrator, Stesichorus, uses the fable as a persuasive instrument, whereas Aristotle, the author, uses the fable to exemplify the genre and its application in a deliberative speech. The fable and its functions have already been discussed above (Stesich. 7F2; Arist. G5).

39F2 Arist. *Rh.* 1393b22-1394a1: Fox, Ticks and Hedgehog (*Aes.* 427; cf. *Aes.* T41)

To the fable referred to above (39F1) Aristotle[2] adds another one[3]:

"A fox, while crossing a river, was driven into a ravine. Being unable to get out, she was for a long time in sore distress, and a number of dog-fleas[4] clung to her skin. A hedgehog, wandering

---

[1] See also above, Arist. 34F/A1; below, Arist. 52A1, 57F1, 57A1-2.

[2] Adrados (1982c, 159-160; 1984c, 27-28; 1987a, 291), detecting iambs in Aristotle's prose, speculates that the latter is paraphrasing a fable by an anonymous fifth-century iambographer, although Aristotle himself already warns that the occurrence of iambs in prose is perfectly normal (see the Final Conclusion below, n. 10; cf. above, Stesich. 7F2, n. 158); cf. Kassel's suggestion (1971, 138) that Aristotle again (as in Stesich. 7T1) quotes from a lost source.

[3] Another fable, not a "parable" (contra Baker 1969, 581), nor an "anecdote" (contra Adamik 1982, 51).

[4] κυνοραιστάς; Arist. Lat. (*Guil.*) (39T4b) *musce canine*. The inquilines are identified with horse-flies by anon. *in Rh.* (39T2b τὰ τζιμούρια ἢ αἱ λεγόμεναι ἀλογομυῖαι); with lice by Adrados (1979a, 408) and Jedrkiewicz (1989, 398); with "dog-ticks" by Jacobs (1889, 27), Klingender (1971, 85) and Kennedy (1991, 180; cf. Handford 1954, 17; Luzzatto 1988, 437); with dog-fleas by Freese (1926, 277), Hinman (1935, 12), Nøjgaard (1964, 87), Davies-Kathirithamby (1986, 157), and Ott (1959, 185); cf. Kovacs (1950, 15), Roberts (1946) and Arnhart (1981, 144); with "Hundsläuse" by Keller (1913, 399); with "Mücken" by Jülicher (1910, I 94). In view

about, saw her and, moved with compassion[5], asked her if he should remove the fleas. The fox[6] refused and when the hedgehog asked the reason, she answered: 'They are already full of me and draw little blood; but if you take these away, others will come that are hungry and will drain what remains to me.'"[7]

This fable[8] is identified as such by its narrator, Aesop[9], and also by the typical occurrence of a *survenant*[10], *in casu* the hedgehog. The fable, itself a metaphorical story, contains another metaphor: the ticks are said to come to *drink* (ἐκπιοῦνται) because they are *hungry* (πεινῶντες).

Aristotle has Aesop tell the fable at Samos[11] in a deliberative (or forensic) assembly (δημηγορῶν[12] (or συνηγορῶν[13])) pleading[14] on behalf of a demagogue[15] condemned to death. Although Aristotle does not say explicitly *with what* the demagogue is charged, it can be inferred from the epimythium that the demagogue's crime (βλάψει) concerned finances (πλούσιος): he has somehow robbed (κλέπτον-

---

of the metaphorical meaning, "leeches", "bloodsuckers" (cf. Arist. Lat. (*anon.*) (39T3b) *yrudines*; Handford lc), or "parasites" (cf. Nøjgaard 1964, 208), would suffice as well. Pannwitz (1966-1967, 57) vaguely sticks to "Insekten".

[5] κατοικτείραντα, invalidating Nøjgaard's assertion (1964, 259) that Aristotle omits "le motif de l'offre du hérisson".

[6] Not a dog (contra Dalfen 1990, 58, probably misled by the "dog-fleas").

[7] Translation by Freese 1926, 277.

[8] Nøjgaard (1964, 253) states that *Dod.* 358 Chambry has been created "sur cette base", although the differences are too manifold to make this assumption plausible. This is not to say, on the other hand, that Aristotle's fable "no ha dado derivados", as Adrados (1987a, 291, where Plu. *Mor.* 790C should be added) asserts, in view of the fable in J. *AJ* 18.6.5 (see above, Chapter I.I, n. 39), *Gesta Rom.* 51 Oesterley.

[9] The modern scholars' evaluation of Aristotle's ascription of the fable to Aesop differ. Sarkady (1968, 9) takes it as a testimony that Aesop actually told this fable at Samos, whereas Nøjgaard (1964, 145) states that for Aristotle "Esope n'est qu'un *prétexte*, un cadre pur". Erasmus (*Cop.* 2 (p. 254 Knott); *Mor. enc.* 26) and Lorichius (1542, 5 (but not ib. 10-11!)) put the fable into Themistocles' mouth.

[10] Nøjgaard (1964, 463) argues that the hedgehog was the *survenant* only in Aristotle's *model*; cf. (in general) the Synthesis above.

[11] This does not imply that the passage derives from Aristotle's *Constitution of the Samians*, as Adrados (1979a, 287) infers; see the preceding chapter, Arist. 34F/A1.

[12] The reading of *Γ*, cf. A, accepted by Spengel, Roemer, Tovar, and Ross (1959), Dufour. Full references of the editions mentioned here and below, nn. 13 and 21, are given by Grimaldi 1988. Arist. Lat.: *perorans* (*anon.*), *populum alloquens* (*Guil.*).

[13] The reading of ΘDE, accepted by Cope, Freese, Kassel (1971, 137), and Grimaldi (1988, 255).

[14] Seriously, not ironically (contra Chambry 1960, p. XXIX).

[15] 1393b9-10 ὑπὲρ τοῦ δημαγωγοῦ. Not a "minister" (contra Bewick 1818, pp. XIIsq).

τες) the Samians (cf. anon. *in Rh.* (39T2a) καταναλώσας δημοσιακὰ πράγματα).[16] The exact relation between the fable and its context is explained (1) in the epimythium[17], which is (like the preceding fable) introduced by a typical formula[18], (2) by verbal parallels[19] between the fable and its context, and (3) by alliterations[20]. These devices unmistakably indicate that the blood-sucking parasites stand for the demagogue stealing property (and the hypothetical parasites for the future demagogues), which implies that the fox (whose blood the parasites drink) represents the Samians (whose property the demagogue steals).

The context intrudes into the fable in two respects: first, the plural form (ἀφελῆτε[21]—if this is the correct reading) by which the fox addresses the single hedgehog is incongruous in the fable but seems to point forward to the application of the fable to the context; thus, in one (grammatical) respect, the fox is addressing not only his fellow character in the fable, but also those whom he represents in its context. Secondly, it is noteworthy that the Greek word for one of the fable characters, viz. the Hedgehog (ἐχῖνος), has a homonym indicating a vase in which the notes of evidence were sealed during lawsuits (see Ar. 17F4). The juridical connotation of this polysemy seems relevant here, as the demagogue is being tried (κρινομένου). These two instances of intrusion tie up the fable with its context more closely.

The function of the fable is to persuade. Aesop appears to be an

---

[16] The indictment was not necessarily "embezzlement", nor "corruption", as Perry (1959, 22; likewise already Bewick, lc) and Klingender (lc) suggest, respectively.

[17] The fable is not equipped with both a promythium and an epimythium, as Adrados (1979a, 402) asserts in his structural analysis of the fable.

[18] ἀτὰρ (οὖν β; *om.* A; see Kassel 1971, 138, comparing *fab. aes.* 13, 30, 35, 53, 131, 150, 178, 182, 204, 208 Hausrath) καὶ ὑμᾶς [Arist. Lat. *Sic enim et nos* (*anon.*); *Ita et vos* (*Guil.*)]; Fraenkel 1920, 367, n. 2; Perry 1940, 397-398; Nøjgaard 1964, 363, 502; Karadagli 1981, 114-115; Jedrkiewicz 1989, 399; Adrados, Holzberg (above, Chapter I.I, 1.7, 1.9).

[19] f.c. ἐὰν δὲ...-ητε, ἕτεροι...*c. ind. fut.*; f. οὗτοι μὲν...τούτους (Parasites) ~ c. οὗτος μὲν...τοῦτον (demagogue); f. τὸ λοιπὸν (Fox's blood) ~ c. τὰ λοιπὰ (Samians' property).

[20] f. πλήρεις (ticks present) ~ c. πλούσιος (demagogue); f. πεινῶντες (ticks to come) ~ c. πένητες (demagogues to come).

[21] Dalfen (1990, 58), apparently preferring Bywater's emendation for ἀφέληται A, which is adopted also by Roemer, Tovar, and Ross (cf. Arist. Lat. (*anon.*) *aufertis*); Grimaldi (1988, 255), however, following Spengel, Cope and Kassel, prefers ἀφέλῃς (cf. Arist. Lat. (*Guil.*) *abstulens*), whereas Freese and Dufour maintain ἀφέλῃ, which is the reading of *ΠΓ*.

expert orator in various ways. First, through a careful selection of the fable characters, he subtly hedges against offending his audience, even while openly representing their proposed line of conduct as self-destructive and, therefore, silly. The Samians will be flattered upon realizing that they must identify with the shrewd fox, whereas they are likely to agree with the representation of the sentenced demagogue by vile bloodsuckers.[22] The latter's hungry drinking (πεινῶντες ἐκπιοῦνται) is a perfect image for people enriching themselves at the expense of others, as both πεινάω[23] and ἐκπίνω[24] can be shown to have had the same metaphorical meaning in Classical Greek literature as English "hanker after" and "thirst for" riches. Secondly, by means of the fable Aesop metaphorically shows the Samians that the same fate is due for them as for the accused: if the Hedgehog would remove (*casu quo* kill) the Ticks, the Fox would die. Thus Aesop drives home to the Samians that the demagogue's death will result in theirs and that, therefore, to save his life is to save their own. Thirdly, Aesop almost imperceptibly introduces the notion of compassion (κατοικτείραντα) into the fable, thus subtly prefacing his request for reprieve of the demagogue condemned to death. Finally, the fable is atypical in that it does *not*, as usual, depict metaphorically the inevitable consequences of the audience's proposed line of conduct: the Fox does *not* allow the Hedgehog to remove the Ticks and therefore does *not* die himself (which would have been a typical *action finale*; cf. D.S. 38F1); instead, he foresees what would happen *if* he did. This deviation from the typical fable scheme (which is adhered to in the preceding fable) may have had two reasons, or (to put it more cautiously) has the advantage of having two implications. First, Aesop refuses on principle to bring the demagogue to death, *even metaphorically*. Secondly, the Samians are thus invited to repent by quasi-spontaneously not implementing their plan. This goes *a maiore*, for if a fox is smart enough to foresee his self-destruction in a timely manner, the Samians will no doubt be.

Aristotle does not report the reaction of the audience.[25] However,

---

[22] Ott 1959, 188.

[23] X. *Cyr.* 8.3.39 ἐκ πένητος πλούσιος γεγένησαι·...πεινήσας χρημάτων ἐπλούτησας. LSJ sv (II 2). Cf. Arist. Lat. *famelice haurient* (*anon.*)/*epotabunt* (*Guil.*).

[24] Pl. Com. *Αἱ ἀφ' ἱερῶν*, fr. 9 *PCG ap.* Ath. 10.66, 446DE. LSJ sv (3).

[25] Karadagli's (1981, 30) conclusion "So rettete Äsop den Demagogen" is unfounded, but finds a (rather late) parallel in Abst. *Praef.*, p. 533 Neveletus: *His verbis moti Samii, ab incepto destitere.*

there is a small (but significant) incongruity between the fable and its context: the fox states that the present (satiated) parasites drink (only) *little* (ὀλίγον) blood, whereas Aesop impresses upon the Samians that the demagogue will *not* harm them *any more* (οὐδὲν ἔτι). In other words, by means of his very fable Aesop implicitly admits that the demagogue, if reprieved, would be likely to continue his misdeeds, if on a less grand scale. If the Samians noticed this flaw in Aesop's argument, they would conceivably have been less inclined to take Aesop's plea to heart.

The fable also functions on a second level, viz. as an example of the genre and its application in a speech. The fable particularly illustrates Aristotle's general remark (G5) that fables are especially suitable in deliberative speeches.[26]

40. *Demosthenes*

40F1 D. fr. 13 Baiter-Sauppe *ap.* Aristobul. *FGrHist*139F3 *ap.* Plu. *Dem.* 23.5, Isid. *Etym.* 1.40, Melanchthon. *Util. fab.*: Sheep, Dogs and Wolves (*Aes.* 153)[27]

On Plutarch's authority (40T2) it can be assumed that the historiographer Aristobulus (40T1 = 36F1) had Demosthenes tell "the fable about the Sheep...which[28] handed over the Dogs to the Wolves". Thus, the fable is a third-degree narration (like Socr. 25F1). The fable is also[29] put into Demosthenes' mouth by Isidore (40T7; G75) and Melanchthon (40T14), at the end of Antiquity and the Middle Ages, respectively.

Plutarch assumes the fable to be well-known, and therefore only alludes to it. The triple use of the definite article in connection with all three fable characters[30] obviously has an allusive function. Plutarch is not referring to sheep, wolves and dogs in general, but to that particular fable in which the sheep surrendered the dogs. Plutarch's

[26] 1393b23 δημηγορῶν (*si vera lectio*) ~ 1394a2 δημηγορικοί; Arist. Lat. (*anon.*) *perorans* ~ *perorabiles*.

[27] For an earlier version of this subsection, see Van Dijk 1993b, 29-30 with 1994b, 123-124.

[28] ὡς: προσῆψε τῷ δήμῳ, ἃ Perrin 1919, VII 56, following "Graux with M^a".

[29] Not: solely (contra Fontaine 1959, 179, n. 5); cf. also Lorichius 1542, 5-6 (following Isidore).

[30] τῶν προβάτων, τοῖς λύκοις, τοὺς κύνας.

words do not make clear whether Aristobulus only alluded to the fable, too, or gave a fuller version, whereas Demosthenes allegedly told the fable *in extenso* (διηγησάμενος). The complete fable is not known, therefore, from the Greek of the Classical orator, the Hellenistic historiographer, or the Imperial biographer, but the Medieval bishop and the Humanist theologian do give full (Latin) versions. Besides, by comparing[31] other versions of the fable[32], allowing for minor variations[33], the outline of the story can be reconstructed as follows: the wolves[34] managed to persuade the sheep to hand over the dogs, allegedly because the latter constituted a major obstacle to peace; the sheep naïvely deprived themselves of their guards, and... the whole flock was torn to pieces. Isidore and Melanchthon further complicate matters by adding shepherds (*pastores*), to whom the wolves pharisaically appeal. From Plutarch's testimony, however, for all its brevity, it is clear that shepherds were no characters in the version of the fable which Aristobulus ascribed to Demosthenes.[35] In all three testimonies, the fable is clearly recognizable as such by a terminological demarcation.[36] The full Latin versions add a typically indefinite introductory time adjunct.[37] The sheep's *action finale* is typical, too.[38]

Plutarch says that Aristobulus related that Demosthenes told the fable when, after the destruction of Thebes, Alexander the Great demanded the extradition of eight[39] demagogues, among them[40] De-

---

[31] Not: by substituting one (thus, misleadingly, Karadagli 1981, 28 (*fab. aes.* 158 Hausrath)).

[32] *Vit. Aesop.* 97; Babr. 93 (5-6 *et ap. Sudam*, β 337 Adler); *fab. aes.* 158 Hausrath; Aphth. 21; *Pa.Bodl.* 219 Chambry; Rom. 63 Thiele; Lib. *Prog.* 1; Nicol. *Prog.* 1.5; cf. Demad. fr. 84 De Falco *ap.* Ps.-Callisth. 2.2.8-16 (pp. 66-67 Kroll); Adrados 1987a, 168-169 (incomplete).

[33] The *Vita Aesopi* adds an introductory war, Babrius (93.6-7) a warning old ram—a typical element in fables; cf. e.g. the warning old ape in Hermogenes' exemplification (G41: the Apes Founding a City (*Aes.* 464)); see Van Dijk 1995a, 243, n. 22.

[34] Jedrkiewicz (1989, 401) erroneously uses the singular form.

[35] With Holden (1893, 108) contra Büchsenschütz.

[36] Plutarch: λόγον, Isidore: *fabulam*, Melanchthon: *apologo*, *fabula*.

[37] Isidore: *aliquando*, Melanchthon: *quondam*; cf. the Synthesis above, n. 8, as well as the Final Conclusion below, n. 4.

[38] Cf. above, D.S. 38F1, Arist. 39F2; in general, the Synthesis.

[39] Demosthenes, Polyeuctus, Ephialtes, Lycurgus, Moerocles, Demon, Callisthenes, Charidemus. The figure of nine orators is mentioned by Arr. *An.* 1.10.4; Drerup 1923, 28-29. Cf. Plu. *Phoc.* 17.2.

[40] Not "ossia" (Jedrkiewicz 1989, 401).

mosthenes himself (335/334 BC). Isidore[41] replaces Alexander with his father, Philip[42], and rounds the number up to ten. Plutarch indicates that the Hellenistic historiographers already diverged concerning the latter variation, Idomeneus (III) and Duris (*FGrHist*76F39)) preferring the high number (like Isidore), the *communis opinio*[43] the low one (like Aristobulus). Melanchthon (wisely, perhaps) does not commit himself to either the name of the "Macedonian" or the exact number of "orators".

Although it is impossible to decide with certainty whether the tradition which credits Demosthenes with this fable in this particular context[44] can duly claim historicity[45], this is made somewhat less improbable by the fact that, on the one hand, a speech (allegedly) delivered by Demosthenes in this historical situation is attested by various testimonies[46], and, on the other hand, the image of dogs protecting sheep against wolves as a (triple) metaphor for politicians protecting, or demagogues pretending to protect, the people against enemies can be shown to have been commonplace in Classical Greek[47]. Moreover, and more particularly, four of these passages, two of them from speeches spuriously attributed to Demosthenes, elaborate the idea of some deviation from the natural mutual relationship between these three species at the expense of the flock. Here, how-

[41] Not Plutarch and Aristobulus (contra Jedrkiewicz lc with n. 13).

[42] This may explain why the (pseudo-)historical context of the fable is dated 336 by Karadagli (1981, 28) and 338 BC by Demandt (1991, 403).

[43] οἱ πλεῖστοι, not "according to some accounts" (Schwarzbaum 1979, 326).

[44] It is noteworthy that in *Vit. Aesop.* 97 (according to Jedrkiewicz (lc) modelled on the passage under discussion) the same fable is used in a comparable situation with the same function, though with an unexpected ending: Aesop tells the fable to the Samians, who are about to hand him over to Croesus; the fable has them change their minds, but Aesop voluntarily follows Croesus (see Van Dijk 1995b, 139-140; 1996a, 533-534, 537).

[45] The historicity of the ascription of the fable to Demosthenes is contradicted by Meuli (1954a, 756), quoting Schafer, but apparently taken for granted by Karadagli, Jedrkiewicz and Demandt (llcc), whereas Fontaine (1959, 179) holds it "vraisemblable que l'apologue...ait été conté dans un plaidoyer disparu".

[46] D.S. 17.15.3; *Suda*, α 1458 Adler (fr. 12 Baiter-Sauppe; cf. Antipho fr. 1 ib.): ἐν τῷ ὑπὲρ τῶν ῥητόρων λόγῳ; cf. Liv. 9.18.7; Drerup 1923, 25-26, referring to Bohnecke and Schäfer, contra Baiter-Sauppe lc.

[47] Cf. Ar. *Eq.* 1017, 1022-1023, *V.* 894sqq (for which see the Appendix below); Burckhardt, A., *Spuren der athenischen Volksrede in der alten Komodie*, Diss. Basel: Birkhauser 1924, 44-45; Jacoby *ad* Aristobul. lc; Meuli 1954a, 756; Jedrkiewicz 1989, 237 n. 37, 377 n. 79. Thphr. *Char.* 29.5; X. 50F1. Mainoldi 1984, 156-160.

ever, it is the dogs, not the wolves, who appear to be corrupt[48]. Lastly, the same triple animal metaphor occurs in a speech ascribed to Demades in the same historical context.[49]

Demosthenes told the fable to dissuade the Athenians from handing over the demagogues to Alexander (Philip) by picturing its consequences metaphorically: once the dogs had been removed, the sheep were devoured by the wolves. Isidore and Melanchthon explicitly state that Demosthenes' fable had a persuasive and a didactic function, respectively.[50] All three testimonies clarify the relation between the fable and its context, if not by the same means. Plutarch[51] explains one metaphor of the fable, and implies another: "Demosthenes...compared himself and his colleagues with dogs fighting for the people". This equation of the orators and the dogs, which is also indicated by one verbal parallel[52], implies that the Athenians are represented by the sheep, as it is the latter for whom the dogs actually fight. At the same time, the participle clause (μαχομένοις[53]) in fact indicates the *tertium comparationis*. Any remaining doubt with regard to the identification of the wolves is removed by the narrator himself (Demosthenes witness Aristobulus witness Plutarch), who continued the imagery outside the fable: "he called Alexander the Macedonian

---

[48] [D.] 25.40: τί οὖν οὗτός ἐστι; κύων νὴ Δία, φασί τινες, τοῦ δήμου. ποδαπός; οἷος οὓς μὲν αἰτιᾶται λύκους εἶναι μὴ δάκνειν, ἃ δέ φησι φυλάττειν πρόβατ' αὐτὸς κατεσθίειν. (...) ἀλλὰ μὴν τοὺς γευομένους κύνας τῶν προβάτων κατακόπτειν φασὶ δεῖν, ὥστ' οὐκ ἂν φθάνοι κατακοπτόμενος; cf. Fontaine 1959, 179. Cf. [D.] 26.22 Καὶ κύνα μὲν ἐπὶ ποίμνην ἀγεννῆ καὶ φαῦλον οὐδ' ἂν εἷς ἐπιστήσειε φυλάττειν. Pl. *Lg.* 906d καθάπερ κυσὶν λύκοι τῶν ἁρπασμάτων σμικρὰ ἀπονέμοιεν, οἱ δὲ ἡμερούμενοι τοῖς δώροις συγχωροῖεν τὰ ποίμνια διαρπάζειν. Id. *R.* 3, 416a Δεινότατον γάρ που πάντων καὶ αἴσχιστον ποιμέσι τοιούτους γε καὶ οὕτω τρέφειν κύνας ἐπικούρους ποιμνίων, ὥστε ὑπὸ ἀκολασίας ἢ λιμοῦ τινος ἤ τινος ἄλλου κακοῦ ἔθους αὐτοὺς τοὺς κύνας ἐπιχειρῆσαι τοῖς προβάτοις κακουργεῖν καὶ ἀντὶ κυνῶν λύκοις ὁμοιωθῆναι. This is not to say that these passages allude to a fable; see the Appendix below.

[49] Demad. fr. 84 De Falco *ap.* Ps.-Callisth. 2.2.16 (p. 67 Kroll) "...πολλάκις δέκα κύνες γενναίως ὑλακτοῦντες ὅλας [τὰς] ἀγέλας [τῶν] ποιμνίων δειλῶς φερομένας πρὸς τοὺς λύκους οὗτοι ἔσωσαν." Cf. Iul. Val. 2.5-8; Karadagli 1981, 29, n. 1.

[50] Isid.: *Demosthenes...finxit...fabulam qua dissuaderet.* Melanchthon: *cum docere vellet in hoc postulari Oratores, ut urbs destituta Oratorum praesidio, regiae tyrannidi pateret... Haec fabula cum docuisset quanti referret Oratores servari...* Cf. *Demosthenes...festivo quodam apologo dissuasit.*

[51] It cannot readily be deduced whether Aristobulus and/or Demosthenes gave this explanation, too.

[52] f. ἐξέδωκε ~ c. συνεκδίδοντες.

[53] Karadagli (1981, 29) prints μαχομένους, which does not seem to be an emendation.

a 'solitary wolf' (μονόλυκον[54] (fr. 13 Baiter-Sauppe))." By means of this device, the parallel between fable and context is stressed.

Unlike Plutarch, the Latin testimonies elaborate the relation between the fable and its context implicitly, not explicitly, but clearly all the same. In what could be called the epimythium of the fable, Isidore implicitly juxtaposes Philip and the wolves, and thus his and their demand and subsequent devastating behaviour.[55] Melanchthon adds a *fabula docet*, that it is of vital importance that the orators be saved[56], which implies that they are compared to the dogs. Both Latin authors link the fable with its context by means of *two* verbal parallels, by which the stipulated extradition of the guard dogs (the orators) is emphasized and focused upon.[57] Furthermore, the Latin versions contain internal evaluations of the fable characters, which show the shepherds' stupidity[58], the wolves' hypocrisy[59] and wanton cruelty[60], and the dogs' indispensability[61].

Demosthenes (quoted in Plutarch's quoting of Aristobulus) connected the fable with its context by adding (ἔτι δ') another type of metaphorical language, a comparison, with the same persuasive function, likewise warning that to surrender the few is to surrender *hoi polloi*.[62] Subsequent to adducing Aristobulus adducing Demosthenes, Plutarch again links up with the fable by having Demades (fr. 51 De

---

[54] LSJ sv, explaining "solitary" by "singularly fierce". Perrin (1919, 57) and Schwarzbaum (1979, p. IV, 326) translate μονόλοκυν by "arch-wolf" (cf. Verres, P., *Plutarchs ausgewählte Biographien*, I: *Demosthenes und Cicero*, Münster: Aschendorff 1958², *ad loc.*), Schäfer (quoted by Meuli (lc) and Karadagli (lc)) by "reißenden Wolf" (cf. Holden 1893, 109), Drerup (1923, 25) by "Riesenwolf"; cf. Ael. *NA* 7.47: ὁ δὲ τέλειος καὶ μέγιστος [*sc.* τῶν λύκων] καλοῖτο ἂν μονόλυκος; Galuski, Ch., *Plutarque. Vie de Démosthène*, Paris: Dezobry, *s.a.*, 61: "unique en son espèce".

[55] *Philippum quoque principes populi postulare* [cf. *condicione*], *quo facilius possit opprimere spoliatam custodibus* [cf. *custodes* (see below, n. 57)] *urbem*. The alliterating p's are conspicuous.

[56] *Haec fabula cum docuisset quanti referret Oratores servari...*

[57] Isid.: f. *dedisse* ~ c. *darentur*; f. *custodes* ~ c. *custodibus*. Melanchthon: f. *dederentur, dediti sunt* ~ c. *dederent*; f. *conditio* ~ c. *conditione.*

[58] Melanchthon: *Placuit stultis pastoribus conditio, canesque dediti sunt.*

[59] Isidore: *lupos...pastoribus, quorum diligentiam decipere voluissent, suasisse...* Cf. Melanchthon: [Philip's] *iniquissimam conditionem.*

[60] Isidore: *Tunc lupi, adempta omni formidine, omne quod in gregibus illis erat, non pro satietate tantum, verum etiam pro libidine laceraverunt.* Melanchthon: *Proinde ubi lupi viderunt excubias caularum sublatas esse, libere grassari in gregem coepere.*

[61] Isidore: *...canes, quos ovium suarum vigilantissimos custodes habebant.*

[62] "ὥσπερ" ἔφη "τοὺς ἐμπόρους ὁρῶμεν ὅταν ἐν τρυβλίῳ δεῖγμα περιφέρωσι, δι' ὀλίγων πυρῶν τοὺς πολλοὺς πιπράσκοντας, οὕτως ἐν ἡμῖν λανθάνετε πάντας αὐτοὺς συνεκδίδοντες." (fr. 13 Baiter-Sauppe); Drerup 1923, 25.

Falco) compare Alexander to another beast of prey (a lion instead of a wolf).[63]

The three testimonies diverge as regards their account of the audience's reaction. Melanchthon not only states that Demosthenes' fable was successful in persuading the Athenians[64], but even adduces it to exemplify the genre's "wonderful power"[65], bracketing it together with the fable of the Members and the Belly[66], by means of which Menenius Agrippa allegedly ended the *secessio plebis* (494 BC). Unlike Melanchthon, however, Plutarch does apparently not[67] consider Demosthenes' fable to have been of overriding importance to the Athenians' decision-making, for he reports that after Demosthenes' speech the Athenians "were deliberating at this [Alexander's] demand and were at a loss how to treat it", until Demades accepted payment from the orators to plea for them with Alexander and[68] "persuaded the king to let the men off"[69]. Isidore does not state the reaction of the audience.

40F2 D. fr. 15 Baiter-Sauppe *ap.* Ps.-Plu. *Mor.* 848AB, Zen. 6.28, Σ *in* Pl. *Phdr.* 260c, Σ *in* Luc. *Herm.* 71, *Suda* ο 400 Adler, ib. υ 327, Phot. *s.v.* ὄνου σκιά, eund. *Bibl.* 265 (495a15-44), Apost. 17.69 (Arsen. 51.54), Erasm. *Adag.* 1.3.52: Youth, Ass and Ass-Driver (*Aes.* 460)

In the *Vitae decem oratorum* ascribed to Plutarch[70] (40T3; freely para-

[63] ὥσπερ λέοντα φόνου κεκορεσμένον. Cf. Plu. *Alex.* 13 μεστὸς ὢν ἤδη τὸν θυμόν, ὥσπερ οἱ λέοντες (the same image in the same context).

[64] *Demosthenes gravis Orator, cum Macedo ea conditione cum Atheniensibus foedus facturus esset, ut illi Oratores sibi dederent, qui perpetuis concionibus animos civium adversus se exacerbarent, iniquissimam conditionem Reipub. festivo quodam apologo dissuasit, quanquam ab ea non ita multum plebs diutino bello vexata abhorreret.* Ibid.: *Haec fabula cum docuisset quanti referret Oratores servari, Rempub. tantisper servavit, dum hoc consilium valuit.*

[65] *Miram quandam fabulae vim inesse, vel haec exempla testantur: necesse est enim efficacissimam orationem fuisse, quae implacabiliter iratis civibus Romanis arma e manibus extorsit, quae Athenienses graviter afflictos adduxit, ut quanquam una voce pacem omnes flagitassent, bellum tamen quam pacem mallent.* Cf. ibid. *mira luce et perspicuitate.*

[66] References are given below, 44. Alcmaeon, n. 8.

[67] Contra Karadagli (1981, 29), who incorrectly paraphrases Plutarch: "Die Athener ließen sich dies gesagt sein und schickten Gesandte an Alexander, um die Auslieferung der Redner zu vermeiden".

[68] φωκίων N [adopted by Lindskog; cf. Plu. *Phoc.* 17]: δημάδης Y (adopted by Perrin).

[69] Translation by Perrin 1919, 59. Cf. D.S. 17.15.2-5; Plu. *Alex.* 13, *Phoc.* 17; Σ *in* Aesch. 3.159 (p. 342 Schultz); cf. Arr. *An.* 1.10.3-6; De Falco (ed. Demad.) 48.

[70] On the authorship, see Drerup 1923, 167-168; Fowler 1936, 342.

phrased by Photius (40T8); translated into Latin by Erasmus (40T13)) the following fable occurs:

"A young man in the summer time hired an ass to go from the city to Megara. When noon came and the sun was blazing fiercely, both he and the owner of the ass wished to lie down in its shadow. Each tried to prevent the other from so doing, the owner maintaining that he had rented him the ass, not its shadow, and the one who had hired the ass that he had complete rights in him."[71]

The fable[72] about the shadow of the ass[73] is put into Demosthenes' mouth[74] by many other testimonies[75]. Among the variations which occur, the following deserve mention. Scholia on Plato and Lucian (40T5-6) give an elaborate version with some additional details: (1) the youth (equipped with the typically indefinite τις)[76] is a student, who (2) is explicitly said to hire the ass as a beast of burden; (3) when the ass refuses to go any further because of the heat, (4) the ass-driver unties the load[77]. In Zenobius (40T4), the *Suda*, Apostolius and Arsenius (40T10b-12) it is the youth, not the ass-driver, who unpacks the ass (καταλύσας τὸν γόμον). Zenobius and Erasmus add the critical observation that testimonies may diverge on the youth's destination, in that some versions have the youth leave for Delphi, not for Megara[78]; this is indeed the case in the *Suda* (40T10b), Apostolius and Arsenius. The three paroemiographers (Zen. Apostol. Arsen.) and the *Suda* (40T10b) add a typically fabulistic indefinite introductory time

---

[71] Translation by Fowler 1936, 435.

[72] Contra: Wienert (1925, 37-38), inconsequently listing it first among "Schwanke", then among "Anekdoten".

[73] Not "del perro" (Cascajero 1991, 30).

[74] In yet other versions, however, the fable is *not* ascribed to Demosthenes: Diogenian. 7.1, 3.43 V; *Suda*, o 401 Adler; Apostol. 12.92 (Arsen. 39.77-78); Ar. 17T22 (Σ), 17T45 (Tricl.).

[75] Therefore, Adrados' remark (1979a, 417) that the fable is "sin tradición" is an understatement. It should be noted that the anecdote on Demosthenes is the fable's frame, not the fable itself (contra Schmalzriedt 1985, 58).

[76] Cf. 40T13 (Erasm.) *quispiam*, *quiddam*, as well as, in general, the Synthesis above.

[77] (1) τῶν ἐπὶ φιλολογίαν εἰς πόλιν ἡμῶν παραγεγονότων, (2) ἐμισθώσατο ὄνον πρὸς τὸ τὰ σκεύη διακομίσασθαι; μεμισθωκέναι...τὸν ὄνον διακομίσοντα αὐτοῦ τὰ σκεύη; cf. τὸ ὑποζύγιον, (3) οὔτε τὸ ὑποζύγιον συνέβαινε (ἐ)θέλειν ὁδοιπορεῖν, (4) καταλύσαντος οὖν τὸ φορτίον τοῦ ὀνηλάτου. For (2-4), cf. Ar. 17T22 (Σ), 17T45 (Tricl.).

[78] Zen. Ἄλλοι δὲ λέγουσιν, ὅτι Ἀθήνηθεν εἰς Δελφοὺς τὸν ὄνον ἐμισθώσατο; Erasm. *Quidam ajunt, asinum Athenis, non Megaram, sed Delphos fuisse conductum.* Cf. Van Dijk 1994a, 106.

adjunct (ποτέ).[79] The two scholiasts, however, have Demosthenes very atypically announce the fable as "a story which did *not* happen long ago" (λόγον οὐ πάλαι γεγονότα), which is noteworthy—but allegedly escaped the audience's notice[80]—in view of the anomalous (open) ending of the fable. Photius and the *Suda* (40T9-10a), finally, make the narrator himself (Demosthenes) the hirer of the ass, and have the ass-driver object on principle, not with a view to profiting himself from the shadow of the ass.

Pseudo-Plutarch states that the fable is told by Demosthenes "when he was being prevented from speaking in the assembly"[81]. The other testimonies slightly[82] change the context, too, by (1) altering the deliberative speech into a forensic one on behalf of some accused[83] and (2) having the audience, *in casu* the judges, not listen[84] to him, instead of preventing him from speaking. Pseudo-Plutarch says that Demosthenes gained his audience's attention by promising to speak only "briefly"[85]; in the other testimonies, Demosthenes requests, and receives, their attention by promising to tell a "story"[86], which is in perfect accordance with the advice of three Latin rhetorical handbooks discussed above (G7-8, G47). The fable is anomalous, if not unique (see below, Demad. 41F1), for its deliberate incompleteness.[87] For, at the critical point in the story, Demosthenes gets ready to leave (Ps.-Plu. ἀπῄει), whereupon his audience begs him to finish the story. Again, minor variations occur in the other testimonies. The *Suda* (40T10b) and the paroemiographers have Demosthenes descend and remount the platform[88], whereas the scholia on Plato and Lucian

---

[79] Cf. n. 37 above, D. 40T7 (Isid.) *aliquando*, 40T14 (Melanchthon) *quondam*; in general, the Synthesis.

[80] τῶν δὲ συγχωρησάντων διὰ τὸ μὴ ὑπολαβεῖν τὸ ὑπ' αὐτοῦ μέλλον λέγεσθαι.

[81] Translation by Fowler 1936, 435. Cf. Phot., *Sudam* (40T9-10a) θορυβοῦντας τοὺς ἀκροωμένους; Σ *in* Pl./Luc. ἐθορύβουν κωλύοντες ἀπολογεῖσθαι.

[82] Contra Karadagli 1981, 51: "in einem anderen Rahmen".

[83] ἀπολογούμενος ὑπὲρ τινος κινδυνεύοντος Zen. *Suda* (40T10a) Apostol. (Arsen.); δίκην γάρ ποτε...ἀπολογούμενος, ἧς τὸ τίμημα ἦν, τί χρὴ παθεῖν ἢ ἀποτῖσαι Aristid. *ap.* Σ *in* Pl./Luc.; ἀπολογούμενον ὑπὲρ τινος ἐπὶ μεγάλαις αἰτίαις κρινομένου Phot, *Suda* (40T9-10a).

[84] οὐκ ἀνεχομένων (Zen. *Suda* (υ))/ἀνασχομένων (Apostol. (Arsen.)) τῶν δικαστῶν.

[85] βραχὺ; cf. Σ *in* Pl./Luc. μικρόν...χρόνον; Phot., *Suda* (40T9-10a) μικρὰ προσέχειν.

[86] διηγήματος τερπνοῦ Zen. *Suda* (40T10b) Apostol. (Arsen.); λόγον οὐ πάλαι γεγονότα Σ *in* Pl./Luc.

[87] For the genre's standard narrative structure, see the Synthesis above.

[88] κατέβαινεν ἐκ τοῦ βήματος; ἀναβὰς πάλιν ἐπὶ τοῦ βήματος.

have him descend and turn around[89]. According to the *Suda* and Photius (40T9-10a), however, Demosthenes does not pretend to go away, but observes that his audience is spellbound[90]. This variation seems less fortuitous, because the effect of surprise is less strong. At any rate, Demosthenes goes on... not, however, to finish the fable, but rather to rebuke his audience for apparently preferring to listen to a story about "the shadow of an ass" than to a speech on serious matters (Ps-Plu.)/a defense of someone who is about to be sentenced to death (other testimonies).

The fable is based upon a proverb (ὄνου σκιά) which frequently occurs in Classical (and later) Greek[91] (and Latin[92]). It is noteworthy that the proverb is once alluded to, and varied, in a speech by Demosthenes himself, stating that it is naive to "quarrel with everybody about the shadow in Delphi".[93] Two paroemiographers deduce that this passage is the origin of both the anecdote about Demosthenes narrating the fable (Diogenian. V 3.43)[94] and, more particularly, the variation of the youth's destination (Zen.; see above), which are educated guesses. The proverb has also been included in other paroemiographical collections[95]. One paroemiographer and two scholiasts, conversely, assert that the fable has become proverbial.[96] The first

[89] κατέβαινεν ἀπὸ τοῦ βήματος,...ἐπιστραφείς.

[90] ὡς εἶδε τοὺς Ἀθηναίους προσέχοντας σφόδρα καὶ ἡδομένους.

[91] Ar. *V.* 191, *Δαίδαλος* fr. 199 *PCG*; Pl. *Phdr.* 260C; Did. (περὶ παροιμιῶν? See Schmidt, M., *Didymi Chalcenteri Grammatici Alexandrini fragmenta quae supersunt omnia*, Leipzig: Teubner 1854, 311) fr. 2 Pearson-Stephens *ap.* Harp. *s.v.* Περὶ...); S. fr. 331 Radt; Arist. *Didasc.* (fr. 625 Rose); Archipp. frr. 35-36 *PCG*; Men. fr. 6 Arnott; D Chr. 34 48; Luc. *Herm.* 71; Orig. *Cels.* 3.1; Hsch. ο 927 Latte. Cf. Zen. 40T4 (Pl. 49T2); Phot. sv Περὶ ὄνου σκιᾶς, 40T9; *Suda* 40T10ab, Erasm. 40T13.

[92] Apu. *Met.* 9.42 *de prospectu et umbra asini...frequens prouerbium*; Otto 1890, 41.

[93] 5.25 πρὸς πάντας περὶ τῆς ἐν Δελφοῖς σκιᾶς νυνὶ πολεμῆσαι; Roschatt, A., *Die Metaphern bei den attischen Rednern*, Programm der K. Studienanstalt Straubing: Lechner 1886, 51.

[94] Meuli 1954a, 756, n. 1 contra Van Leeuwen (copied by Karadagli 1981, 51 (misinterpreted by Jedrkiewicz 1989, 402, n. 16)).

[95] Greg. Cypr. L 3.23; Macar. 6.37, 7.8; Arsen. 43.49 (Apostol. 14.22a).

[96] Σ *in* Pl./Luc. (40T5-6) φασὶ δὲ εἰλκύσθαι τὴν παροιμίαν ἀπὸ τοῦ Δημοσθένει τῷ ῥήτορι συμβάντος. (...) ὅθεν τό τε τοῦ διηγήματος εὔστοχον καὶ τὸ τοῦ φρονήματος παρρησιαστικὸν διαμνημονευθὲν παροιμίας ἔλαβε τάξιν. Diogenian. V 3.43 ἐξ αἰτίας τοιαύτης. Ar. 17T22 (Σ) ἀπὸ τοιαύτης αἰτίας, ὅθεν ἡ παροιμία; D. 40T13 (Erasm.) *sunt qui credant hoc adagii primum ab auctore Demosthene natum fuisse, fabulam hujusmodi referentes...* Cf. Otto lc; Cohoon, J.W.-Lamar Crosby, H., *Dio Chrysostom*, III, Loeb, 1940 (repr. 1961), 383, n. 2.

possibility is far more likely[97] than the second one, because the anecdote containing the fable seems to presuppose the existence of the proverb in which it culminates: the point of Demosthenes' final rebuke is far more convincing if the expression "the shadow of an ass" was already established at the time. Besides, other proverbs and expressions show that the proverb at hand is perfectly understandable without any explanatory story. "Shadow" appears to have been a common metaphor for something insignificant[98], whereas the bad repute in which the ass was held can probably go without elucidation[99]. The metaphorical meanings of both constituting elements are cumulative (ὄνου is possessive genitive). Therefore, the expression is at once intelligible as referring to something utterly trivial, which is also apparent from the paroemiographers' (and the scholiasts') explanations[100].

The relation between the (deliberately incomplete) fable and its context is somewhat loose: in Pseudo-Plutarch neither the narrator nor his audience, nor some third party, is metaphorically depicted in the fable. At first sight, the only connection between the fable and its context seems to be a negative one: the audience's unconditional appreciation of the very fable is contrasted with the dereliction of

---

[97] Weil, H.-Dalmeyda, G., *Les Harangues de Demosthène*, Paris: Hachette 1912³ (repr. Hildesheim/New York: Olms 1974), 212. Cf. Fowler 1936, 434, n. a; Karadagli 1981, 51. Adrados (1987a, 388) does not make a choice. Rein (1894, 71-72) observes that the proverb ὄνου παρακύψεως (Men. *Ἱέρεια*, fr. 211 Koerte-Thierfelder (cf. Ps.-Luc. *Asin.* 45: λόγος), allegedly derived from a fable told in Zen. 5.39 (*Aes.* 459)) is a close parallel; cf. the combination of the two proverbs in Apuleius (see above, n. 92; Erasm. *Adag.* 1.3.64 (pp. 136E-137B)).

[98] *App. Prov.* 3.44 καπνοῦ σκιά: ἐπὶ τῶν λίαν ἰσχνῶν, καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν ἀστάτων καὶ ἀφανῶν (cf. A. fr. 399 Radt *ap.* Stob. 4.34.44; S. *Ant.* 1170 (quoted by Eust. *in* Il. I 378), *Ph.* 946; *Com. Adesp.* fr. 692 Kock *ap.* Macar. 5.4; Lib. *Ep.* 200; Eup. *Αὐτόλυκος α'β'*, fr. 59 *PCG ap.* Σ *in* Ar. *Nu.* 252; Erasm. *Adag.* 2.4.2 (p. 532 F); Diogenian. 5.88 κανθάρου σκιά: ἐπὶ τῶν φοβουμένων τὰ μὴ ἄξια φόβου (cf. Greg. Cypr. L 2.50, Apostol. 9.40 (Arsen. 32.23)); Pi. *P.* 8.95 σκιᾶς ὄναρ; Leutsch-Schneidewin *ad App. Prov.* lc, LSJ *s.* σκιά (3); Van Thiel 1971, 210-211; cf. Salzmann 1910, 94.

[99] See e.g. Keller (1909, 265-266), Van Thiel (lc), as well as the asinine proverbs in the paroemiographical collections.

[100] Zen. Apostol. (Arsen.) ἐπὶ τῶν περὶ μηδενὸς χρησίμου φιλοτιμουμένων; Diogenian. V 3.43 ἐπὶ τῶν εὐτελῶν καὶ οὐδενὸς λόγου ἀξίων; *App. Prov.* 4.26 ἐπὶ οὐθενείας καὶ ματαίας φιλονεικίας; Σ *in* Pl./Luc., Macar. 6.37 ἐπὶ τῶν μηδενὸς ἀξίων; Arsen. 43.49 (Apostol. 14 22a) περὶ [ἐπὶ Phot. sv Περὶ ὄνου σκιᾶς] τῶν ἐνδιατριβόντων τοῖς μηδενὸς ἀξίοις; Ar. 17T22 (Σ) ἐπὶ τῶν τὰ ἀνόνητα φιλονεικούντων, 17T45 (Tricl.) ἐπὶ τῶν μαχομένων περὶ τῶν μηδενὸς ἀξίων. Erasmus self-critically applies the proverb to his exhaustive treatment of it: *Sed jamdudum tempus ut ab asini umbra digrediamur, ne quis jure nos rideat,* περὶ ὄνου σκιᾶς *plus satis curiosos.*

their duties. Thus Demosthenes' fable functions *a minore*: if the audience shows interest in trivialities like an ass's shadow, they certainly should pay attention to the grave subject which Demosthenes wants to broach. Closer inspection, however, does reveal a *tertium fabulae*: both the fable and the anecdote framing it are about willingness and its opposite. Of these complementary key themes the (negative) latter is indicated by more or less synonymous words, the (positive) former by a marked repetition of the same *verbum voluntatis*. Demosthenes is prevented (κωλυόμενος) by his audience from speaking, the youth by the ass-driver, and *vice versa* (εἶργον ἀλλήλους), from using the ass's shadow; Demosthenes wants (βούλεσθαι) to speak briefly, his audience (βούλεσθε) to listen to a story, rather than (οὐ βούλεσθε) to serious matters, whereas in the fable both characters want to (ἐβούλετο) lie down in the ass's shade. The versions by the scholiasts on Plato and Lucian have only one verbal parallel[101] which emphasizes this thematic parallelism, but the other testimonies have none at all. Instead, the latter seem to emphasize the relation between fable and context more strongly. As has been remarked above, Photius and the *Suda* (40T9-10a) have the narrator of the fable represent himself as one of the fable characters. Furthermore, the other testimonies, by changing the deliberative context to a forensic one, approach the final quarrel of the fable more closely to the actual situation, in that both are judicial conflicts[102]. In the paroemiographers' version[103] this resemblance is made explicit by the addition that "both entered the lawcourt" (εἰσῆλθον εἰς τὸ δικαστήριον ἀμφότεροι), the very last words of the fable proper. Thus the narrator, Demosthenes, creates a perfectly smooth transition from fiction to reality: he abruptly cuts off the fable precisely upon reaching the context, *in casu* the lawcourt. This correspondence is emphasized by the quadruple occurrence of δίκη-words.[104]

Pseudo-Plutarch does not report the reaction of the audience, but some other testimonies do: Apostolius (Arsenius) adds that "by thus rebuking the judges Demosthenes saved the accused's life".

---

[101] Σ *in* Pl /Luc : f κωλύοντος ~ c κωλύοντες, κωλύετε.

[102] Cf Phot , *Sudam* (40T9-10a) ὥστε διατριβὴν αὐτοῖς καὶ φιλονεικίαν πολλὴν περὶ τούτου γενέσθαι, Σ *in* Pl /Luc πολλὴν ἀντιλογίαν („/γενέσθαι) συνέβαινεν ἐκ τούτου(,) εἰς μάχην ὥρμησαν

[103] Cf Ar 17T22 (Σ) εἰς τὸ δικαστήριον κατηνέχθησαν, Erasm *Demum in jus ambulabant* Contra Wienert's paraphrase (1925, 37) of Pseudo-Plutarch as "Der Prozess um des Esels Schatten".

[104] f τὸ δικαστήριον ~ c τῶν δικαστῶν *bis*, τῆς δίκης.

41. *Demades*

41F1 Demad. fr. 22 De Falco *ap. fab. aes.* 63 Hausrath (cf. Dati 40): Demeter, Swallow and Eel (*Aes.* 63)

One of the fables in the anonymous prose collections (41T1) is put into Demades' mouth:

"Demeter was travelling in company with a[105] swallow and an eel. When they reached the bank of a river, the swallow flew up into the air and the eel plunged into the water."[106]

The fable[107] is clearly recognizable as such by a terminological demarcation and a connection with the name of Aesop (Αἰσώπειον μῦθον *bis*, object, alternately, of εἰπεῖν and ἀκούειν, in itself illustrating the oral transmission of fables); besides, Demades' fable contains a typically indefinite place adjunct (κατά τινα ποταμόν)[108]. In the Humanist Latin version by Leonardo Dati (41T2)[109], Demeter is, curiously enough, replaced with a lark.[110]

The fable is allegedly told by Demades (*Demas* in Dati) in a deliberative assembly (δημηγορῶν; cf. Arist. G5)—when the audience did not bear attention to him, which is again (like in D. 40F2) in accordance with the advice of three Latin rhetorical handbooks (G7-8, G47). Demades asks (ἐδεήθη...εἰπεῖν), and receives (Τῶν δὲ συγχωρησάντων αὐτῷ), permission to tell them an Aesopic ("funny" (*lepidam*) Dati) fable. The fable is again (like D. 40F2) deliberately left incomplete, for the narrator stops at a critical point in the story. The

---

[105] Karadagli's (1981, 49) and Adrados' (1987a, 84) double use of the definite article is not *in style.*

[106] Translation by Handford 1954, 190.

[107] Contra: Wienert (1925, 38), apparently vaccilating between "Anekdote[n]" and "Marchen[s]"; Van Rooijen-Dijkman 1984, 6: "Een fabel? Eerder een antifabel" (for which concept see, however, Jochum (K.P., "Die Fabeln James Thurbers", in: Hasubek 1982, 241) and Carnes (1992; "The Japanese Face of Aesop: Hoshi Shin'ichi and Modern Fable Tradition", *Journal of Folklore Research* 29, 1992, 1-22; cf. "The American Face of Aesop: Thurber's Fables and Tradition", *Moderna Språk* 79, 1986, 3-17 (repr. in: id. 1988, 311-331)) on modern fabulists like Thurber (*Fables for Our Time...* (see above, Achae. 15A1, n. 15); *Further Fables for Our Time*, New York 1956) and Hoshi Shin'ichi (*Mirai Isoppu*, Tokyo 1971)).

[108] Likewise *fab. aes.* 65 Hausrath, cf. 26: ἔν τινι ποταμῷ, 98: εἴς τινα ποταμόν, 160: ἀπό τινος ποταμοῦ, Theon. G21c: παρὰ ποταμόν τινα; Van Dijk 1994a, 96, 110 n. 4; cf. the Synthesis above.

[109] Contra Adrados 1979a, 417: "Sin tradición posterior." (not to mention La Fontaine 8.4)

[110] This might be due to Dati's "mangelhaftes Latein" (Tacke 1912, 284 (where, however, the fable under discussion is not mentioned)).

pause is a perfect question mark: of the three characters, two (Swallow and Eel) have disappeared, so it is quite natural to ask after the third (Demeter (the Lark in Dati)). This the audience does, thus giving Demades the opportunity to rebuke his audience: "She is ("I am" in Dati) angry with you...because you disregard affairs of state and are all ears for Aesop's fables ["fictitious birds" in Dati]."[111] In itself, a fable embedded in an anecdote[112] is an anomaly in the fable collections; Demades' fable has been somewhat assimilated to the common, independent type in that the anecdote is equipped with the typically indefinite introductory time adjunct "once" (*ποτε/olim*).[113]

The historicity of the anecdote, *casu quo* the fable embedded in it, cannot be established with certainty.[114] However, both the fable and its context are comparable with other fragments from speeches by Demades. As for the context, Demades seems to have had some experience with uncooperative audiences[115]; as for the fable, Demades seems to have had some predilection for metaphorical statements[116].

At first sight, the fable again (like D. 40F2) seems to lack any resemblance to its context. But the alliteration and assonance (two η's and one α) between the proper names Demades ~ Demeter (Δημάδης ~ Δήμητρα) might contain a hidden clue for the interpretation of the fable (not in Dati). This wordplay reveals that the narrator, Demades, metaphorically depicts himself in the fable by Demeter; this is also apparent from Demades' final rebuke, whose third person singular (κεχόλωται) is in fact equivalent to a first one (κεχόλωμαι), for it

---

[111] Translation by Handford lc.

[112] Therefore, "Demeter, la golondrina y la anguila" (Adrados 1979a, 417) is a better title than "El orador Démades" (ib. 43; id. 1987a, 84). Also, Demades is not to be listed among "Fabelmotive" (contra Schmalzriedt 1985, 58) but among *narrators* of fables.

[113] Compare the fables connected with an episode of Aesop's legendary life (see above, Chapter I.III, 4.1). For *olim*, cf. the Synthesis above, n. 8, as well as the Final Conclusion below, n. 4.

[114] De Falco (*ad loc.*), referring to Blass (1898 (III^3.2), 275-276), and pointing to "l'arguzia" and "[dal]la enorme semplicità non certo casuale della favola", lists the passage under discussion among the "frammenti genuini", although it belongs to "orazioni che non possiamo in alcun modo determinare"; cf. Marzi, M.(-Feraboli, S.), *Oratori Attici Minori*, II, Torino: UTET 1995, 649, n. 1. La Fontaine (8.4.60), however, perhaps confusing Demosthenes and Demades (Michel-Martin 1969, II 67-68), has the anonymous orator speak about Philip.

[115] Ib. fr. 16 θορυβηθεὶς; fr. 20 θορυβούμενος ὑπὸ τοῦ δήμου; fr. 21 ὁ αὐτὸς ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ θροούμενος εἶπεν 'οὐκ ἐμὲ ἐκωλύσατε λέγειν ἀλλ' ἑαυτοὺς ἀκούειν'.

[116] Cf. ib. frr. 12-13, 15, 17-18, 20, 23-26, 84 (quoted above, n. 49).

is Demades who is angry, not Demeter. This would, strictly speaking, have been illogical: the narrator of a fable can, but a fable character cannot, rebuke the audience for preferring fables to politics. In Dati's version, in view of the ultimate position of the fable in his collection (see below), Demades' rebuke, for using a first person singular (*Indignor*), might also be interpreted as the writer himself urging his readers to resume their work instead of reading fictitious fables.

Starting from the equation Demeter ~ Demades, it is perhaps not too far-fetched to interpret the sudden disappearance of the bird in the sky (ἔπτη) and of the fish[117] in the water (κατέδυ) as a metaphorical representation of the politicians' disregard (ἐάσαντες) of their duties. The fable itself structurally, almost "metafabulistically", expresses its abrupt end: the river is an obstacle[118] for which the animal fable characters disappear; only Demeter (Demades) remains. Thus the transition from fiction to reality is again (as in D. 40F2) smooth, if sudden. In view of the fact that Dati concludes his collection of forty fables with Demades' fable, which does not seem accidental, it does not seem too far-fetched to interpret Dati's version "metafabulistically" in yet another respect: by its very incompleteness the fable could be interpreted to represent the abrupt end of the collection it is part of. Dati stopped at 40, although in the subsequent epilogue he states that he could go on to 1000[119]. The critical function of Demades' fable is also expressed in the epimythium: "It is thoughtless folly [ἀλόγιστοι; cf. Dati 40.13 *mentis inops*] when men neglect important business for the sake of pleasure."[120]

The reaction of the audience is not reported. Jean de La Fontaine, however, omitting[121] Demades' name, apparently assumes that the fable was successful, for he uses its application as an exemplification of "Le pouvoir des fables" (8.4)[122]:

---

[117] Not "deux oiseaux" (contra Dandrey 1992, 227, perhaps influenced by Dati's version (which, however, is not mentioned)).

[118] Cf. Dandrey 1992, 227-228.

[119] † [Tacke 1912 *ad loc.* does not report the reading of the MS] *canam, uatis, tibi carmina mille,* | *Aesopi, si uis, carmina mille canam.* The epilogue is missing in the MS described by Berrigan 1982, 21.

[120] Translation by Handford lc.

[121] Like Abst. *Praef.* (p. 533 Neveletus: *orator Atheniensis*), Michel-Martin 1969, II 67) and Desmay (M.L.S., *Esope du temps*, Paris 1677: "un autre Isocrate, un autre Demosthéne"; Grimm, J., "Le pouvoir des fables: Ein Beitrag zur Ästhetik der La Fontaineschen Fabel", *Zeitschrift für Französische Sprache und Literatur* 80, 1970, 41-42).

[122] See Grimm, *art. cit.*; Dandrey 1992, 221-272.

"A ce reproche l'assemblée,
Par l'apologue réveillée,
Se donne entière à l'orateur:
Un trait de fable en eut l'honneur."

42. *Philodemus*

42A1a Phld. *Rh.* 2, fr. 3.11-12 (p. 68 Sudhaus) (cf. *PHerc.* 1573[123]): Jackdaw (*Aes.* 101)

A passage from the second book of Philodemus' *On Rhetoric* reads as follows:

"'they [i. e. rhetoricians]...adorn themselves with borrowed plumage.'"[124]

Philodemus here alludes to the fable of the jackdaw who embellished himself with other birds' feathers in order to be able to compete in a beauty contest organized by Zeus; his disguise deluded the divine arbitrator, but not the other birds, who exposed the impostor by stripping him of his false plumage.

This fable, to which the passage under consideration is the oldest[125] extant reference, must have enjoyed great popularity, witness its inclusion in the major collections[126]—displaying minor variations[127]—and, particularly, the many allusions[128], which amply outnumber the full versions.

---

[123] See Dorandi, T., "Per una ricomposizione dello scritto di Filodemo sulla Retorica", *ZPE* 82, 1990, 77; cf. Longo Auricchio, F., *Φιλοδήμου Περὶ ῥητορικῆς libri primus et secundus*, Napoli 1977, p. XVIII.

[124] Translation by Hubbell 1919/1920, 287. Adrados (1987a, 116) detects metrical elements in Philodemus' prose.

[125] Adrados (1979a, 506) states "es dudosa la antigüedad de la fábula", but elsewhere (1985, 340) qualifies Philodemus' version as "particularmente arcaica".

[126] Babr. 72; *fab. aes.* 103 Hausrath; Aphth. 31; Lib. *Prog.* 1.3; Theoph. Sim. *Ep.* 34; *Pa.Bodl.* 163 Chambry; *Tetr.* 1.29; Tz. *H.* 8.494-506 (205); Niceph. Basil. *Prog.* 1.7. Cf. Phaedr. 1.3; Rom. 45 Thiele (*Aes.* 472).

[127] The Latin versions (Phaedr., Rom.), omitting the beauty contest and having the jackdaw adorn himself only with peacocks' feathers, are perhaps better regarded as another, if cognate, fable. Various Greek versions add a messenger from Zeus, either Iris (Babr., *Pa.Bodl.*) or Hermes (Lib., Aphth.); most specify the bird who was the first to detect the fraud: either a swallow (Babr., *Pa.Bodl.*, *Tetr.*) or an owl (Lib., Aphth., Theoph., Tz.). For fuller descriptions of the differences, see Fuchs 1886; Austin *s.a.* [1912 ?], I, 305-327; Adrados 1987a, 115-117 (none, however, discussing all versions).

[128] Hor. *Ep.* 1.3.18-20, Porph. *ad loc.*; Ach. Tat. 2.38.2 (see Van Dijk 1996a, 524-525); Luc. *Apol.* 4, *Pseud.* 5; Tat. *Orat.* 26; Tert. *adv. Val.* 12; Ruf. *Apol. c. Hier.* 2.27;

The above quote occurs in Philodemus' discussion of conflicting Epicurean views on whether or not rhetoric is an art, either *in toto* or in part. Philodemus puts the allusion to the fable into the mouth of rival Epicureans.[129] To these the allusion serves as an illustration—a kind of metaphorical paraphrase—of their previous argument that rhetoricians show off things which are in reality extra-rhetorical[130]: "'the technical elements they [i. e. rhetoricians] borrow from other arts e. g. certain eristic elements and ambiguities from dialectic'"[131]. These exemplifications may be connected with the very fable alluded to: "eristic" may be taken to refer to the fable, which is—as many fables do[132]—about a dispute indeed (cf. Babr. 72.3, Lib. *Prog.* 1.3 ἀγῶνα; Aphth. 31 ἀγὼν), whereas the introductory swearword "by Zeus" seems to convey an "ambiguity" in view of the part the god plays in the fable.

It is clear that in the given fable the rhetoricians are metaphorically represented by the jackdaw and the other arts (e.g. dialectic) by the other birds. The latter metaphorical relation is indicated by a verbal parallel[133], whereas the former is apparent from the smooth integration of the allusion in its context: the rhetoricians, not the jackdaw, are said to strut with borrowed feathers (ἐ- | κόσμησαν [ἑαυτούς). These equations imply that the jackdaw's misappropriated plumage stands for the technical elements appropriated by the rhetoricians. The latter are thus implicitly branded as impostors whose ostentation cannot prevent their insignificance from coming out.

Hipp. *Haer. Praef.* 11 ?; Hier. *Ep.* 108.15, *Lib. Did. Alex. Praef.*; Lib. *Ep.* 19.7, 1522.3, *Or.* 57.55 *ap.* Eust. *Il.* Ω 582-586, *Od.*, ω 1; Them. *Or.* 24, 306b; Eus. *PE* 10.4.27; Greg. Naz. *Carm. Mor.* 1.29.55-57, *Or.* 4 *c. Jul.* 1.107; Nonn. Abb. *in* Greg. *Or. 1 adv. Jul.* 63; Thdt. *Affect.* 7.37; Eun. *Hist.* 87 (see Van Dijk 1993b, 34; 1994b, 131-132, nn. 148-156); Psel. *Orat.* 14.164-165 Littlewood, *Orat. hag.* 8. 34-35 Fisher; Eust. *Eth.* (p. 331 Tafel); Tz. *Ep.* 42 (p. 61 Leone); Nicet. Chon. *Or.* 11 (p. 108 Van Dieten); Erasm. *Adag.* 3.6.91, *Cop.* 2 (p. 255 Knott), *Mor. enc.* 3.

[129] Accordingly, this allusion might have been discussed instead under "anon. *ap.* Phld. *Rh.*..."

[130] Cf. Gaines, R.N., "Philodemus on the Three Activities of Rhetorical Invention", *Rhetorica* 3, 1985, 156.

[131] Hubbell's translation (1919/1920, 287) skips some words.

[132] Cf. ἤριζον in the *incipit* of Babr. 64-65, *fab. aes.* 12, 14, 20, 46, 71, 106, 132, 233, 251, 254, 258 (Cas; FACrBBaU ἐφιλονείκουν) Hausrath (see Karadagli 1981, 102-104); *Streitgedichte* (Call. 20F2, Trypho 61A1 with n. 20).

[133] c. ἄλλων (arts) ~ f. ἀλλ[οτρίοις (birds).

42A1b Phld. *Rh.* 2, fr. 3.25-27 (p. 68 Sudhaus) (cf. *PHerc.* 1573): Jackdaw (*Aes.* 101)

Philodemus immediately (and typically[134]) counterattacks by hoisting the rival Epicureans with their own petard, alluding to the same fable: "he [the philosopher] struts with borrowed feathers like the jackdaw, borrowing from poetry, rhetoric, geometry, astrology and music"[135] (quintupling his opponents' exemplification).

Provided that Sudhaus' restoration of the text is plausible, the second allusion is nearly identical with the first on a formal level: four words recur, if in a different order, two literally (πτεροῖς ἀλλοτρίοις), two inflected (ἑαυτο-, κοσμε-). Again, the allusion is smoothly integrated in its context: the philosopher, not the jackdaw, is said to have adorned himself with borrowed feathers ([...ἑ- | αυτὸν... | κε]κόσμ[η-κεν). At the same time, however, two differences can be observed. First, Philodemus applies the fable to its context even more clearly than he had his opponents do, in that he makes explicit the comparison of the philosopher to the jackdaw (κολοιοῦ τρόπον). Secondly, the given fable may be identical, but its function is not: Philodemus does not so much refer to the dressed-up jackdaw to criticize the philosopher for committing intellectual plagiarism but, rather, to negate his Epicurean opponents' argument. By imitating their allusion, Philodemus shows that their criticism of rhetoric is tantamount to the pot calling the kettle black.

43. *Demetrius*

43A1 Demetr. *Eloc.* 157: Man and Guest (*Aes.* 422)

Demetrius copies[136] (transposing ποτε and ὤν) Aristotle's allusion (57A1) to an aetiological fable about an eagle who "once when it was human...broke the laws of hospitality"[137].

[134] "A method of argumentation traditional in Epicurean polemic" (Innes, D.C., "Philodemus", in: Kennedy, G.A., *The Cambridge History of Literary Criticism*, I: *Classical Criticism*, Cambridge: UP 1989 (repr. 1995), 215).

[135] Hubbell (1919/1920, 287) again produces an epitome rather than a verbatim translation.

[136] Therefore, Adrados (1979a, 495) incorrectly lists Aristotle's fable among fables "que carecen de tradición en época helenística y tardía" (which he tentatively attributes to "descuido de Demetrio").

[137] Throughout this and the next subsection, translations are by Roberts, W.R., *Demetrius on Style*, Cambridge: UP 1902 (repr. Hildesheim: Olms 1969), 145, 147.

The fable, which is characterized by a terminological demarcation (μῦθος) and a typically indefinite introductory time adjunct (ποτε)[138], functions on two levels. The fable serves primarily as an aetiology, explaining why it is that eagles die because their beaks grow crooked. Secondarily, Demetrius refers to the fable to demonstrate that the opportune telling of a fable, more particularly of a familiar one (κειμένῳ...καὶ κοινῷ), is charming. The first function will be discussed below (Arist. 57A1), whereas the second one has already been discussed above (G10). At a somewhat higher level, the fable may said to be connected with its context in that almost every section of the treatise contains a quotation or reference to another literary source as an exemplification of some stylistic aspect.

43A2 Demetr. *Eloc.* 158: Moon and Cat (not in *Aes.*[139])

In the next chapter, Demetrius quotes from some unknown writer:

"whence the fable that the moon gave birth to the cat".

The fable is, like the preceding one, recognizable as such by a terminological demarcation (μῦθος), and functions on two levels. On the first level (see below, auct. inc. 58F/A1), the fable is an aetiology, explaining why cats wax and wane with the moon. On the second level (see above, G10), the fable exemplifies the elegance of using fables in timely fashion, more specifically, fables made up extempore in accordance with, and illustrating, their context (προσπλάσσομεν προσφόρους καὶ οἰκείους τοῖς πράγμασιν). Demetrius deems both "the actual trick of invention" and "the fable itself...making the cat the child of the moon" charming. This fable, too, can be considered to be connected also with its context in a larger sense of the word, in that it is just one of the numerous heterogeneous texts quoted or alluded to in *On Style* as stylistic specimens.

Conclusion

All of the fables (but not the allusions) discussed in the present Chapter are very similar to those from the preceding one, in that they constitute the greater part of a (mostly deliberative) speech delivered

[138] Like in D. 40T4, 40T11-12 (Zen. Apostol. Arsen.); cf. n. 79 above, as well as the Synthesis.

[139] See Van Dijk 1994a, 103-104, 108.

by an orator to Greek citizens (Stesichorus to the Himeraeans, Aesop to the Samians, Demosthenes (twice) and Demades to the Athenians).

Since these speeches have been preserved only by other writers, the same stratification can be observed as in the fables occurring in Historiography, viz. a primary, oral and (pseudo-)historical, and a secondary, written and contemporary level. One of Demosthenes' fables (40F1) is still more complex in that it is a third-degree narration (like Socr. 25F1). The indirect tradition casts at least some doubts on the authenticity of the speeches, *casu quo* the fables allegedly inserted in them, although Demosthenes' and Demades' fables can be connected with passages from genuine speeches by these orators.

The use of all (five) fables—oratorical "practice"—is in perfect accordance with precepts given in handbooks—rhetorical "theory"—discussed above (in Chapter I.II), but another distinction should be drawn. Three fables (Aristotle *bis*, D. 40F1), having a persuasive function, can be connected with Aristotle's recommendation (G5) of the use of fables in deliberative speeches, the other two (D. 40F2, Demades[140]) illustrate the advice given by Latin rhetoricians (G7-8, G47) to regain the audience's attention by telling a fable.

Both Aristotelian fables closely resemble one another (which is attributable to the author rather than to the narrators) in various respects: as for their form, regarding their contents—both convey veiled criticism[141] of some leader (a tyrant and a demagogue), which in turn links them thematically with the other exemplifications adduced[142]—, and qua function—both have a persuasive and an illustrative function on the two aforesaid levels. In addition to an epimythium, verbal parallels and instances of metaphorical interaction connect the fables with their contexts. The first fable typically shows the audience why the decision being considered is detrimental to them, whereas the second one, subtly operating *a minore*, shows them why a *different* decision than the one under consideration is more salutary, or rather: less detrimental, to them. In both cases the reaction of the audience is not reported.

---

[140] See, e.g., Meuli 1954a, 755-756; Perry 1959, 22.

[141] Differently Nøjgaard 1964, 557: "Stésichore comme Esope parlent pour conserver l'ordre établi!"

[142] The two παραβολαί deal with the "problem of selecting good rulers", the two historical examples with the "threat of conquest by foreign rulers" (Arnhart 1981, 144).

Both of Demosthenes' fables are connected with episodes from the orator's life. The use of Demosthenes' first fable is much like that of Aristotle's, particularly his first one, in that it metaphorically depicts the consequences of some action under the audience's consideration; conveys criticism of a leader (*in casu* Alexander); and features an instance of fable-context interaction (continuation of the fable's metaphor), as well as (like in Aristotle's second example) a tactful selection of the fable characters. The testimonies are, however, not unanimous in their report of the audience's reaction.

Demosthenes' second fable is comparable with Demades' in that both are deliberately left incomplete and almost imperceptibly return to their contexts at a critical point in the story. In both cases the audiences' questions elicit the narrators' final rebuke that duties, not fables, demand their attention now. At first sight, the relation between these two fables and their contexts seems somewhat loose; however, thematical correspondences do connect both the narrator and his audience with particular fable characters, which Demosthenes suggests by verbal parallels, and Demades by linguistic means (assonance; cf. the use of alliteration in Aristotle's second fable). Demades' fable can also be interpreted "metafabulistically" on both levels.

Philodemus twice alludes to the same fable successively. The form of these allusions is nearly the same, but the second one negates the first. Both allusions are smoothly integrated in their context, but (as far as can be judged from the lacunal papyrus) the analogy between the fable and its context is expressed more explicitly in the second instance than in the first, which features one verbal parallel and two subtle cases of fable-context interaction (Νὴ Δία, ἐ[ρισ]τικὰ).

Both of Demetrius' (like both of Aristotle's) fables function on two levels. On the first level, both have an aetiological function; on the second level, both serve to exemplify the charming use of fables.

CHAPTER TEN

PHILOSOPHY

non fastidiuit aliquando suis libris inserere [sc. *fabulas*] *Aristotiles* [sic], *celestis ingenii uir et Perypatheticorum princeps philosophorum.* (Arist. 52T1 (Bocc.))

Non erubuit profecto praestantissimus et optimus vitae magister Plato ac sapientissimus disertissimusque vivendi dux Plutarchus suis scriptis Aesopi sales, urbanitates et exempla tamquam flosculos et instituta intersere<re>. Quin immo et pulchritudini rerum suarum et decori futurum esse intellexerunt, si eius dicta gravitate comitateque referta interessent. (Pl. 49T13 (Barb.))

"even the Greek Socrates, whom Apollo confirmed to be the only wise man, is said to have spent part of his old time in putting Aesop's fables into verses." (Sidney 1595, 130)

"A peine les fables qu'on attribue à Ésope virent le jour, que Socrate trouva à propos de les habiller des livrées des muses. Ce que Platon en rapporte est si agréable, que je ne puis m'empêcher d'en faire un des ornements de cette préface." (La Fontaine 1668, 33)

44. *Alcmaeon*

According to Isidore of Sevilla (44T1; G75), *Romulus Vindobonensis*[1] (44T2), and Conradus Hirsaugiensis (44T3), Alcmaeon of Croton is traditionally regarded as the inventor of fables. However, these rather late testimonies find no support in the extant writings of Alcmaeon.[2] Instead of simply dismissing these Medieval Latin statements as ill-founded, attempts may be made to determine their basis.[3]

First, Alcmaeon may have been considered to be the fable's πρῶτος εὑρετής because he was the first to distinguish animals from

---

[1] Contra Nøjgaard 1964, 447: "la supposition d'*Isidore*...est isolée"; likewise Fontaine 1959, 176.

[2] Nevertheless, Thiele (1908, 394, n. 2) considers Isidore to be "eine gar nicht zu unterschatzende Tradition".

[3] Contra Pugliarello (1973, 24), who includes Alcmaeon among "semplici nomi, che restano per noi privi della possibilità di essere inquadrati in un ambiente storico, sulla cui esistenza è lecito...dubitare". Fontaine (1959, 177, n. 3), referring to Clem. Al. *Strom.* 1.16.78, tends to "supposer à l'origine de la notice isidorienne une tradition heurématique sur Alcméon."

man[4]. It has already been remarked above (G75) that Isidore excludes human beings from Aesopic (if not from Libyan) fables.

Another possible clue might be located in a medical metaphor which Alcmaeon applied to politics: monarchy causes illness, isonomy health[5]; hereby Alcmaeon probably[6] meant that in a state, just as in the human body, the well-being of the whole is proportionate to the close cooperation of all parts. This idea also underlies the fable of the Members revolting against the apparently privileged Belly; their strike drove the entire Body to (and in some versions even over) the brink of starvation.[7] Tradition has it that by means of this fable Menenius Agrippa dissuaded the Roman plebeians from seceding from the patricians in 494 BC.[8] Possibly[9] (and approximately simultaneously) Alcmaeon applied the aforesaid metaphor[10] in a comparable political context (if showing the other side of the picture), warning the Crotoniates against Clinias' tyranny. But even if Alcmaeon did not, Isidore may in a sense justly call him the inventor of *fabulae*, since, *according to tradition*, Menenius' fable is the oldest one *in Latin*.

But Isidore's "Alcmaeon" might also be explained more prosai-

---

[4] Thphr. *Sens.* 25-26 (24A5 Diels-Kranz); Wachtler, J., *De Alcmaeone Crotoniata*, Leipzig: Teubner 1896, 39; Stella, L.A., "Importanza di Alcmeone nella storia del pensiero greco", *Reale Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei s.VI*, 8.4, 1939, 23; Kirk-Raven 1960, 233; Dierauer 1977, 39; Sorabji, R., *Animal Minds & Human Morals. The Origins of the Western Debate*, London: Duckworth 1993, 9.

[5] 24B4 Diels-Kranz *ap.* Aet. 5.30.1.

[6] See Capizzi 1983, 160, with further references (n. 10).

[7] Other fables which express the same idea are Max. Tyr. 15.5: Foot and Body or Molar (not in *Aes.*); *fab. aes.* 132 Hausrath, Synt. 35, *Syr.* LII, 52, Rom. 66 Thiele: Stomach and Feet (*Aes.* 130); D.Chr. 33.16: Eyes and Mouth (*Aes.* 461); Plu. *Agis* 2.5, Babr. 134, *fab. aes.* 291 Hausrath, *Pa.Bodl.* 289 Chambry: Snake's Tail and Other Members (*Aes.* 362); cf. Adrados 1987a, 140-141 (incomplete), 517 (Medieval versions).

[8] D.H. 6.86.1-3; D.C. fr. 17.10-11; Liv. 2.32.9-11 (cf. G11; quoted by Pomey 1665, 13-14); Flor. *Epit.* 1.17 (23); Plu. *Cor.* 6.3; *Vir. Ill.* 18.2-4; Quint. G18b; Zonar. *Epit. Hist.* 7.14; Bocc. *Geneal.* 14.9.95-96; Erasm. *Cop.* 2 (p. 254 Knott); Melanchthon, *Util. fab.*; *Lib. sive carmen de ventre* (Bolte, J., *Andrea Guarnas Bellum grammaticale und seine Nachahmungen*, Berlin: Hofmann 1908, 241-246); Hes. 2T43 (Abst.); Gellert 1744, 18. See Gombel 1934; Hale 1968; Peil 1985, 1987; Hoefmans 1992-1993; Van Dijk 1993b and 1994b *passim*; cf. Kemper 1996. Nestle (1927) searched for the origins of the fable in fifth century "Homonoialiteratur", but it has an Egyptian prototype dating from the eleventh century BC: see Wienert 1925, 15; Nojgaard, 1967, 425, n. 52; Brunner-Traut 1959, 40-41, 56; Adrados 1985, 113-114.

[9] Capizzi's "evidente" (1983, 160) seems overconfident.

[10] Not necessarily a "storia" like Menenius' (contra Capizzi 1983, 162).

cally as a corruption of *Loqman*[11], the Arab Aesop[12], notice of whom may have reached Isidore's episcopal see, Hispalis. This seems plausible in view of the curious corruptions[13] of the mysterious fabulist's name; the initial "Al-" may simply be derived from the Arabic article (like the first syllable "al" of many words and proper names in modern Spanish—like *Alcázar* and *Alhambra*—reveals their Moorish origin).

45. *Antiphon*

45F1 Antipho Soph.[14] 87B54 Diels-Kranz *ap.* Stob. 3.16.30, 4.40.19: Man, Other Man and Some Man (cf. *Aes.* 225)

From Antiphon's *Περὶ ὁμονοίας* Stobaeus (45T1a) quotes the following fable[15]:

"There is a story of a man who saw another man getting a large sum of money and asked him to lend it him at interest. But the second man refused. He was the kind of man to distrust others and never help anyone. He took the money and stored it away[16]. A third man heard of what he had done and stole it. Some time later the man who had put it away went and failed to find the money.[17] So in

---

[11] For Loqman, see Stoetzer, W., "Aesopus en Lokman. Aantekeningen over de integratie van Aesopus in de Arabische cultuur", in: Idema-Schipper-Schrijvers 1993, 158-168; for Erpenius' 1615 Latin translation, see Ross 1964.

[12] Hertzberg 1846, 125; Dressel 1876, 21. Perry (1952, 230, n. 1; followed by Blake, W.E., in his review of Perry 1952, *AJPh* 75, 1954, 82-83) suggests that it is the other way round, which seems less likely.

[13] "Alcinon Cortoniensis": *Rom.*; "Alcimon": Conr. Hirs.; "Alemo Cracoviensis" (Roth 1846, 526, n. 4, probably following Steinhöwel (in: Leibfried-Werle 1978, 4); "Alcman" (see the Appendix below).

[14] The so-called "Antiphontean question", already debated by Hermog. *Id.* 2.399-401 Rabe (87A2 Diels-Kranz), has still not been settled. Compare—to mention only one recent exponent from the unitarian and separatist camps, respectively—Avery 1982 and Pendrick 1987, both with further literature.

[15] Duemmler (quoted by Jacoby 1908, 14): "Parabel"; Jedrkiewicz 1987, 61, n. 75: "aneddoto"; Furley 1992, 208, neutrally: "Erzählung", "Geschichte".

[16] ἀπέθετο. Bignone (1938, 84) and Jedrkiewicz (1983, 262; 1987, 61, n. 75; 1989, 367; cf. Dumont 1969, 183: "enfouir") seem to forget that, unlike Aesop, Antiphon does not have the man *bury* his money (rightly Jacoby 1908, 13: "non...defodisse, sed...deposuisse").

[17] Jedrkiewicz's paraphrase (1983, 262; 1987, 61, n. 75) of this episode—"sotterra [see preceding note] il suo tesoro per vederselo rubare"—is inaccurate, as the thief is not caught *in flagrante delicto*.

great distress at his misfortune, particularly because he had not lent it to the man who had asked him, since in that case not only would he have had the money safe, but it would have earned interest as well, meeting the man who on the earlier occasion had wanted to borrow, he bewailed his misfortune, saying that he had made a mistake and was sorry he had not done what the other man wanted but had refused, since the money was now quite lost. The first man told him not to worry, but to believe that he had the money in his possession and had not lost it. He should put a stone in the place the money was. 'For you made absolutely no use of the money when you had it, so there is no need to think you have lost anything.'"[18]

The fable is recognizable as such by a terminological indication (λόγος) as well as by the typical indefiniteness of all three protagonists (ἀνὴρ ἄνδρα ἕτερον, τις; cf. τις λόγος and τις in the epimythium) and of the local adjunct (ὅποι; see the Synthesis above). The fable is explained in an epimythium:

"Indeed, what a man neither uses nor intends to use, it makes no difference whether he possesses it or not, he is not harmed more or less. For if God wishes to bless a man but not without reservation, he gives him plenty of money but poverty of good sense; and by taking away the one he commonly deprives him of both.'"[19]

The use of key words in both the fable proper (ἀνήρ; χρήματα; ἔχρησε, ἐχρῶ; ὑφείλετο; στέρεσθαι) and its epimythium (ἀνδρί; χρημάτων; ἐχρήσατο, χρήσεται; ἀφελόμενος; ἀπεστέρησεν) leaves no doubt as to its *Aussage*: "a man" should "use" his "money" lest it be "taken away" and he be "deprived" of it. These verbal parallels indicate that the protagonist of the fable serves as a model for the unspecified "man" in the epimythium (cf. German "Mann" and "man"), and that the thief—perhaps somewhat unexpectedly—represents the divine agent. It is clear that the protagonist's example is unworthy of imitation, not only from the fact that the man appears to be punished by god's hand, but also from two explicit evaluative remarks in the epimythium (μὴ παντελῶς...ἀγαθὰ; τοῦ καλῶς φρονεῖν...πένητα): things look bad for fools[20], even if they are rich.

---

[18] Translations from 87B53-54 Diels-Kranz by Morrison, J.S., in: Sprague 1972, 230-231.

[19] This does not belong to the fable proper; rightly Altwegg 1908, 18; Jacoby 1908, 39-40. The second sentence is also quoted by Stob. 45T1b.

[20] The fable is not about "uomini non malvagi" (Momigliano 1930, 139).

The apparent simplicity of the narrative[21] is elusive (not to mention some tropes[22]), for four verbs conceal a significant polysemy. First, the man is said to "take up" (ἀναιρούμενον—a monetary *terminus technicus*) a large sum of money, but the verb is used also for "taking up for burial" and (if usually in the active voice) for "annulling, cancelling", which is in fact what the man is going to do with the money. Secondly, ἀποτίθεμαι may mean both "put by for oneself, stow away" (what the man intends to do) and "put away from oneself" (what he actually does); besides, the connotation of "exposure", for which the verb is commonly used, is also to the point, as the abandoned fortune becomes a foundling. Thirdly, κατατίθεμαι may mean both "deposit in a place of safety" (what the man intends to do) and "bury [the dead]" (what actually happens, as the money is taken out of circulation (compare English "dead money")). Lastly, the verb χράω is used three times in the middle voice meaning "to use", but once in the active voice as a synonym of δανείζω "to lend [furnishing its use]"; this wordplay is emphasized by the use of its derivative χρήματα "money".[23] Ironically enough, three of these verbal roots (but not ἀποτίθημι) may convey also monetary meanings which do precisely *not* fit in the story: "taking up" for a lease, "paying [putting it down as payment]", and "debt", respectively. These *jeux de mots* contribute to the richness of the interpretation of the fable: the man "gets" money but "annuls" it by "taking" it "up" as for a burial; he "puts" it "away for", but also "from", "himself", "exposing" it, so to speak; he "stores" it away, thus converting it into "dead capital"; instead, he should have "used" "the money" by "lending" it. The use in the fable of words conveying monetary connotations is counterbalanced by one monetary metaphor in the epimythium, emphasizing the financial character of the fable: the man is called "poor" (πένητα) in spirit.

These *double entendres* have been lost completely in the abbreviated form in which the fable has ended up in the collections[24]: the polyse-

---

[21] Cf. Jacoby 1908, 40: "fabulam vulgarem".

[22] See Jacoby 1908, 58-59, 63; cf. (in general) Gomperz 1912, 60-63. These tropes do not in themselves, of course, prove that Antiphon the sophist is identical with the orator of the same name.

[23] See LSJ svv ἀναιρέω, ἀποτίθημι, κατατίθημι, χράω, χρῆμα.

[24] *Fab. aes.* 253 Hausrath (Adrados 1987a, 241-242 (not mentioning the passage at hand)): Φιλάργυρος. A connection with the Rhamnusian Antiphon's "reputation for φιλαργυρία" (Avery 1982, 155; Pendrick 1987, 51; cf. Pl. Com. *Πείσανδρος*, fr. 110 *PCG ap.* [Plu.] *Mor.* 833C; Antipho fr. 1 Thalheim; X. *Mem.* 1.6 (cf. Morrison, J.S.,

mous terms in which Antiphon couches the man's acquiring and putting away his money have been replaced with unequivocal ones (ἐξαργυρισάμενος I, III/ἐξαργυρωσάμενος II, κατορύξας I, II/ κατώρυξε III), whereas the (key) theme of the unwilling moneylender turning down a would-be borrower has been omitted in the fable proper, although the use of the word χρῆσις ("use" and "lending/ loan"[25]) in the epimythium might be a relic of this theme. The monetary metaphor for men's foolishness has disappeared from the epimythium. In contrast, these simplifications pay Antiphon an indirect compliment on the subtle pecuniary polysemy of his version of the fable.

Although the direct context of the fable does not survive, the fragment fits well into its context in a broader sense of the word, Antiphon's *On Concord*. In general, the fable, urging the addressee to put out his money, is typical of the hedonistic calculus taught by the sophist.[26] The title of the treatise as well as the parenthesis in which the man is characterized as "the kind of man to distrust others and never help anyone" has misled some[27] into believing that Antiphon employs his fable to preach some sort of charity. However, the protagonist of the fable is not criticized for showing lack of altruism but, conversely, for failing to promote his self-interest. He should have increased his capital by lending it at interest. Thus he would, admittedly, have rendered the borrower a service—hence the parenthesis—, but this would only have got thrown in with the bargain. Self-interest would (and, according to Antiphon, should) have been his ultimate motive, not love of his neighbour. More particularly, the fable can be connected with another fragment (87B53 Diels-Kranz) preserved by Stobaeus (3.10.99), which rebukes men who keep on "increasing their possessions" (προστιθέντες ~ 87B54 ἀπέθεκεν,

"Xenophon, *Memorabilia* I.6: The Encounters of Socrates and Antiphon", *CR* 67, 1953, 3-6; id., "Socrates and Antiphon", ib. 69, 1955, 8-12)) is tempting, if unclear.

[25] See LSJ sv.

[26] Cf. 87B49, 58, 60 Diels-Kranz; Nill 1985, 69-70.

[27] Bignone 1938, 5: "pregia...la liberalità"; Nestle 1944, 194: "rät...zur gegenseitigen Unterstützung und Aushilfe". Therefore, the title "Fabel vom Geizigen" (Nestle lc; likewise Aly 1921, 257, 293: "vo(n de)m Geizhals"; Jedrkiewicz (1983, 262; 1987, 61, n. 75; 1989, 367; cf. Bignone 1938, 84): "L'Avaro") is out of place: Antiphon reprehends the protagonist of the fable for displaying a lack, not a surplus, of egocentricity (cf. Altwegg 1908, 20). Nor is the fable a consolation for the loss of money (thus recently Furley (1992, 208-209, comparing Ps.-Plu. *Mor.* 833CD and pointing to "Der psychologische Wortschatz Antiphons" (214-216), but see Jacoby (1908, 14) and Altwegg (1908, 39) contra Buresch).

καταθέμενος, καταθέμενον) but "suffer..pain" (ἀλγοῦσιν ~ 87B54 περιαλγῶν) when they "diminish" (ἀφαιροῦντες, ἀφαιρούμενοι ~ 87B54 ὑφείλετο, ἀφελόμενος) them and "use them up" (χρώμενοι ~ 87B54 ἔχρησε, ἐχρῶ, ἐχρήσατο, χρήσεται)[28]. Possibly another fragment, reading only "to love money" (φιλοχρηματεῖν), belongs to the same context.[29] One may compare also yet another fragment, in which Antiphon presents the example of those who "make preparations with great eagerness as if they had another life to live"[30] as unworthy of imitation.

46. *Socrates*

46F Socr. *ap.* Pl. *Phd.* 60c-61b, Plu. *Mor.* 16C, Avian. *Praef.*, Syn. *Dion* 15, Aug. *Cons. Evang.* 1.12, Psel. *Orat.* 25.169-174 Littlewood

It has already been stated above (G3) that in Plato's *Phaedo* (46T1) Socrates says that he has versified some[31] of Aesop's fables[32] in prison, in a final attempt to obey a dream which he repeatedly had in his life and which urged him to make "music". He had always interpreted this dream as a divine protreptic to practise philosophy, but now wondered whether he should instead compose poetry. The genre is characterized by its ascription to Aesop (60d1, 61b6 Αἰσώπου) and terminology (61b6 μύθους but 60d1 λόγους (see above, Chapter I.III, 1.3)).

The historicity of Socrates as a fabulist is problematic. In principle and *a priori*, there is no reason to query this any more than the other biographical details which the *Phaedo* contains about Socrates. Plato's

---

[28] οἱ δὲ ἐργαζόμενοι μὲν καὶ φειδόμενοι καὶ ταλαιπωροῦντες καὶ προστιθέντες ἥδονται οἷα δή τις ἂν εἰκάσειεν ἥδεσθαι. ἀφαιροῦντες δὲ καὶ χρώμενοι ἀλγοῦσιν ὥσπερ ἀπὸ τῶν σαρκῶν ἀφαιρούμενοι. Cf. Altwegg 1908, 17, 19-20, 96-97; Momigliano 1930, 139; Moulton, C., "Antiphon the Sophist and Democritus", *MH* 31, 1974, 137; Nill 1985, 70.

[29] 87B103 Diels-Kranz *ap.* Poll. 3.113; Altwegg 1908, 20, 96-97.

[30] 87B53a Diels-Kranz *ap.* Stob. 3.16.20. Cf. Altwegg 1908, 15-17, 20, 96-97; Momigliano 1930, 139; Nill 1985, 70.

[31] Not: "one" (Chroust 1957, 279, n. 791, confusing Socr. 25T1 (D.L.) and 46T1 (Pl.).

[32] Not necessarily "eziologie" (Jedrkiewicz 1989, 408), nor necessarily "in Elegienform" (Geffcken 1897, 93 (likewise Dareste 1846, 88-89), probably extrapolating from Socr. 25T1 (D.L.)). Arendt (1982, 487) speculates "daß er [Sokrates] in seiner Situation für den schlauen Fuchs bereits ein gewisses Verstandnis fand."

notice has indeed been taken as a literary-historical fact from antiquity onwards[33], witness paraphrases from Plato by Plutarch (46T2; G24b), Augustine, Synesius (46T3-4) and Psellus (46T6). On the one hand, Plato's testimony can be connected with other ones. Two Socratics (Plato and Xenophon) have Socrates tell or allude to (in total four) fables (49F1-2, 49A1, 50F1); it is possibly[34] these which Avianus (46T5; G59) has in mind when he states that Socrates used fables by way of examples in his "works". Another Socratic (Phaedo 51F1ab) has a fable told *to* Socrates.[35] Furthermore, comparisons of the type which Socrates (allegedly) often used are put on a par with fables by Aristotle[36] (G5). Although fables may have been part of Socrates' discussion technique, the Socratic promythium quoted by Diogenes Laertius (cf. the *Suda*) is probably apocryphal (see above, Socr. 25F1).

On the other hand, it is clear that Plato has a literary goal in presenting Socrates as a late-blooming fabulist: Socrates' Aesopic versification in the face of death aptly illustrates his imperturbability.[37] The subject matter which Plato has Socrates choose can be taken to be pregnant: Aesop may be considered to be Socrates' kin-

---

[33] Some (Schanz 1894 contra Volquardsen; Hausrath 1909, col. 1732; Von Christ-Schmid-Stahlin 1912, 653, n. 1; Chroust 1957, 279, n. 791; Josifović 1974, 35) doubt the historicity of Socrates as a fabulist, others (Hirzel 1895, I 262; Grawi 1911, 29 contra Hausrath lc; Pannwitz 1966-1967, 56; West 1984, 109; cf. Oldaker 1933/1934, 85-86; Vlastos, G., *Socrates. Ironist and Moral Philosopher*, Cambridge...: UP 1991, 33 n. 44, 251; Oberg 1996a, 241-242) do not.

[34] Ellis 1887, 50; Duff-Duff 1935, 681, n. c. Differently Kuppers 1977, 182, n. 3: "Vielmehr ist diese falsche Aussage Avians eine bewußte Manipulation [*sc.* der Phaidon-Stelle]". According to Gaide (*ad* Avian. G59), however, Avianus alludes to Plato's *myths* (but cf. n. 65 below).

[35] Furthermore, Phaedrus twice (3.9, *App.* 27 (*Aes.* 500, 554)) presents Socrates as a fable *character*.

[36] Jedrkiewicz 1989, 114.

[37] Hausrath (1909, col. 1732 contra Schanz 1894; contra: Grawi 1911, 29, n. 3), adding "außerdem vielleicht auch die vorwiegend dem Ethischen zugewandte Richtung seiner Interesse" (contra: Gerhard 1909, 246, n. 4); likewise: Burgess, Th.C., "Epideictic Literature", *Studies in Classical Philology* 3, 1902, 235-236, n. 1; cf. Dareste 1846, 88; Bluck 1955, 40. Arnheim (1979/1980, 1) interprets Socrates' "reworking Aesop's fables in verse" as "an indication of the high esteem in which he held them". Bluck (lc), however, detects "some irony here on the part of Plato", expressing his "poor opinion of poets who wrote 'not fact, but fiction' (cf. 61B)"; cf. Rowe 1993, 122. Gouldner (A.W., *Enter Plato. Classical Greece and the Origins of Social Theory*, London: Routledge & Kegan Paul 1965, 337) emphasizes that "here... Socrates is portrayed as launching a more expressive and aesthetic work", one of the "moments when Socrates seems to respect the more irrational side of himself".

dred spirit, in that both[38] were sentenced to death on the basis of a contestable accusation of some kind of desecration in connection with the Apollo cult.[39] Socrates' remark that he selected Aesop's fables because he is not a story-teller (μυθολογικός) himself obviously goes with some irony[40], as he both previously (60c2 μῦθον ἂν συνθεῖναι (Pl. 49F1)) and subsequently (61e2 μυθολογεῖν, 70b6 διαμυθολογῶμεν) indulges in precisely this activity.

At a higher level, the theme of Socrates' Aesopic versifications is connected with the overall theme of music in the *Phaedo*.[41]

47. *Democritus*[42]

47A1 Democr. 68B224 Diels-Kranz *ap.* Stob. 3.10.68: Dog and Meat (*Aes.* 133)

Stobaeus (47T1) preserves the following Democritean fragment:

---

[38] There are some differences both in the accusation (Aesop: theft of a bowl by the Delphians; Socrates: not worshipping the gods by the Athenians) and (contra Luzzatto 1988, 444) in their connection with Apollo (Aesop: offending/expiating (not: telling fables at the instigation of (thus Avian (G59; see Ellis 1887, 50)); Socrates: devotion (on which, see Clay, D., "Plato's first words", *YCS* 29, 1992, 122-123) to the god).

[39] Compton 1990, 340-341; Schauer-Merkle 1992, 85-86 (if neglecting the passage under discussion; see Van Dijk 1994c, 386); Holzberg 1993, 20; cf. Gigon, O., "Die Sokratesdoxographie bei Aristoteles", *MH* 16, 1959, 177; Duchemin 1960a, 264. The similarities observed by Pannwitz (1966-1967, 64: "So sind sie—Asop und Sokrates—selber Ratsel, die ihre Losung in sich tragen wie die Fabeln"), Patterson (1991, 6-7: "both shared, in legend, a remarkable physical ugliness"; cf. Gigon, O., *Westöstliche Abhandlungen R.* Tschudi *zum 70. Geburtstag*, Basel 1952, 198, n. 26) and Schauer-Merkle (lc: "Sowohl Sokrates als auch Asop stammen aus einfachen Verhaltnisse und ziehen aufgrund ihrer außerordentlichen geistigen Fahigkeiten die Aufmerksamkeit der Menschen auf sich"; cf. Jedrkiewicz 1989, 111-114) seem less striking. Ziolkowski (1993, 8) thinks that Socrates took Aesop's fable as "a weapon of the small and weak against the mighty". FitzPatrick (P.J., "The Legacy of Socrates", in: Gower, B.S.-Stokes, M.C. (eds.), *Socratic Questions. New Essays on the Philosophy of Socrates and its Significance*, London/New York: Routledge 1992, 192), equating "Aesop's fables" and "animal tales" (likewise Compton 1990, 341, but see Van Dijk 1995a), fantasizes that "the birds and the beasts in the *mythoi* show that Socrates cannot do without warm-blooded things any more than we can".

[40] Friedlander 1960, 34 (but cf. 1954, 183); Reale 1973, 23, n. 15; Gallop 1975, 78; Rowe 1993, 122. Differently Couturat 1896, 4: "illo loco [61b] Socratem ipsum..., hoc autem loco [60c] Platonem ipsum, sub Socratis persona, intellegendum esse[t]".

[41] Cf. Loriaux 1969, 40-41.

[42] Democrates according to Laue 1921, 83.

"The desire for more spoils what one has, like the Aesopic dog."[43] The connection with Aesop's name indicates that Democritus here alludes to the widespread[44] and well-known[45] fable of the dog who was carrying a piece of meat across (or: along) a river. She took her own reflection for another dog carrying another piece of meat across (or: along) the river. She snapped at it, thus losing the real piece of meat, without catching the imaginary one.

Democritus explicitly (ἰκέλη γινομένη) compares the dog to the desire for *more* (τοῦ πλέονος), for which it is a suitable image, as in most versions the dog is said to snap at the piece of meat carried by her imagined congener because she thinks that it is *bigger*[46] than the one which she is carrying herself.

The quondam direct context of the fragment under consideration has not been preserved, but it fits well, more generally, into the broader context of Democritean ethics. Stobaeus' anthology includes various γνῶμαι in which the Abderite warns against greed (πλεονεξίη) and recommends modesty (μετριότης) and self-satisfaction (αὐτάρκεια), urging to enjoy what one has instead of lamenting what one does not have, and to be content with little instead of desiring much.[47] Hence, Democritus may appropriately use the insatiability of

---

[43] Adaptation of Kahn's translation (1985, 30): "like the dog in Aesop's fable"; cf. Blackham 1985, 176.

[44] Phaedr. 1.4; Babr. 79, Ps.-Dos. 11, Aphth. 35, *fab. aes.* 136 Hausrath, *Branc.* 4, Synt. 28, *Syr.* XXXI Lefevre, *Pa.Bodl.* 186 Chambry, *Tetr.* 1.9, Rom. 6 Thiele, Jo. Sard. *in* Aphth. (p. 13 Rabe) (Adrados 1987a, 142-145 (incomplete), 446 (medieval versions; cf. Mayer 1917, 29-30)).

[45] Witness the allusions in Theon G20c *bis* (II 75, 78 Spengel); Σ *ad loc.* (I 258 Walz); *PMich.* G45 (6, 8); Epiph. *Haer.* 41.3-4; Iren. *Adv. Haer.* 2.11.1; Hier. *Ep.* 29.7; Sopat. Rh. G58; Σ *in* Aphth. (II 11-12 Walz); Doxap. *in* Aphth. (II 159, 188-189 Walz); Nicet. Chon. *Hist.* (p. 407 Van Dieten). Eust. (*Il.* Φ 595-607), however, "haud accurate fabellam descripsit" (Van der Valk *ad loc.*).

[46] Babr. πολὺ...μείζω; *fab. aes.*, Eust. μεῖζον; Ps.-Dos. μείζονα...(οὗ) ἔφερεν; Aphth. διπλασίαν, τὸ μεῖζον, τοῦ πλείονος; Synt. πολλῷ..., οὗ ἔφερεν, εὐμεγεθεστέραν; *Syr.* "plus grande que ce qu'il tenait" (in Lefevre's translation). But not *Branc.*: κρέας ὅμοιον.

[47] Especially 68B231 Diels-Kranz *ap.* Stob. 3.17.25 εὐγνώμων ὁ μὴ λυπεόμενος ἐφ' οἷσιν οὐκ ἔχει, ἀλλὰ χαίρων ἐφ' οἷσιν ἔχει and ib. B284 *ap.* Stob. 4.33.24 ἣν μὴ πολλῶν ἐπιθυμέῃς, τὰ ὀλίγα τοι πολλὰ δόξει; cf. also ib. B86 *ap.* Stob. 3.36.24; ib. B219 *ap.* Stob. 3.10.43; ib. B286 *ap.* Stob. 4.39.17; see Natorp, P., *Die Ethika des Demokritos*, Marburg: Elwert 1893 (repr. Hildesheim/New York: Olms 1970), 107; Stewart 1958, 181, 184 (comparing Sen. *Ben.* 7.1.6 and ib.2.6); Kahn 1985, 17-19; Nill 1985, 80-82, 112 n. 27; Vannier, F., "Sagesse, richesse et pouvoir selon Démocrite", *DHA* 14, 1988, 110; Spinelli 1991, 294-296, 303. Grottanelli (1987, 566, 572 n. 87) compares Democritus and Aesop.

Aesop's dog as an example unworthy of imitation, for the fable illustrates[48] that "wealth without intelligence is an unsafe possession"[49] and that "fools desire what is absent, but they waste what is present..."[50]

48. *Antisthenes*

48F1 Antisth. fr. 100 Caizzi (68 Giannantoni) *ap*. Arist. *Pol.* 1284a15-17: Lions and Hares (*Aes.* 450)

The outline of a fable by Antisthenes has been preserved thanks to an allusion by Aristotle (48T1), who refers to

"what, in the fable of Antisthenes, the lions said to the hares, when in the council of the beasts the latter began haranguing and claiming equality for all"[51].

Antisthenes' fable[52] must have been well known at the time, for Aristotle only alludes to it. However, the latter's testimony is isolated, as Antisthenes' fable does not survive and other fables with the same protagonists obviously do not apply.[53] Therefore, the exact content of Antisthenes' fable and, more particularly, the lions' *ipsissima verba*

---

[48] Natorp (ib. 82) compares Democritus' frequent use of personifications.

[49] 68B77 Diels-Kranz *ap*. Stob. 3.4.82 δόξα καὶ πλοῦτος ἄνευ ξυνέσιος οὐκ ἀσφαλέα κτήματα; Nill 1985, 80, 84; Spinelli 1991, 307.

[50] 68B202 Diels-Kranz *ap*. Stob. 3.4.76 ἀνοήμονες τῶν ἀπεόντων ὀρέγονται, τὰ δὲ παρεόντα...ἀμαλδύνουσιν. Laue 1921, 83; Langerbeck, H., *Doxis Epirhysmie. Studien zu Demokrits Ethik und Erkenntnislehre*, Berlin 1935 (repr. Dublin/Zürich: Weidmann 1967, 59, 72; Mesiano, F., *La morale materialistica di Democrito di Abdera*, Firenze: Le Monnier 1951, 63, 68-69; Kahn 1985, 29; Nill 1985, 82.

[51] Translation by Jowett 1943, 154 (= Everson 1988, 72). Jedrkiewicz (1983, 262) incorrectly paraphrases the fable: "i leoni rifiutano l'offerta di concludere un trattato di pace, avanzata dalle lepri".

[52] Schütrumpf 1991, 525: "Parabel".

[53] Contra Newman's suggestion (1902, 243, comparing Cydias *ap*. Pl. *Chrm*. 155D) that Aristotle alludes to "a version of the fable of the Lion and the Wild Ass (Babrius, Fab. 67 [*Aes*. 339]) in which lions and hares joined in hunting and fell into a dispute as to the division of the spoil" (*quod non*). Another hare turns up in this fable in a version by Nieuwenhuizen, J. van, *Phaedrus' Aesopische fabels opnieuw in verzen verteld*, Den Haag: Van Hoeve 1964, 17 (see Solinge A.G. van, *Leeuwe- en andere delen. Enkele gedachten over winstdeling bij personen- en kapitaalvennootschappen* (inaugural lecture Catholic University Nijmegen, January 13, 1995), Zwolle: Tjeenk Willink 1995, 1, n. 1). The peaceful coexistence of the weak (a hare, i.a.!) under a mild King Lion in Babr. 102, *Pa.Bodl.* 196 Chambry (*Aes*. 334) might be a Cynical theme (Adrados 1987a, 363; 1987b), but is not in accordance with the polemic tone of the context in Aristotle's *Politics*. Nor does *fab. aes*. 153 Hausrath (*Aes*. 146) apply, for the lion behaves in an asinine manner.

cannot be ascertained. Nevertheless, reconstructing Antisthenes' fable to some extent is not an utterly hopeless task. It is reasonable to deduce from Aristotle's allusion, for all its brevity, that the lions somehow[54] put the hares in their place. First, witness Aristotle, Antisthenes had the lions say something (λέγοιεν...ἂν...ἅπερ Ἀντισθένης ἔφη τοὺς λέοντας...) to the hares' demand; in all probability, in view of the former's application of the fable (52A1), the lions' ripost was the *coup de grâce* to the hares' plea for equal rights in the latter's version too. Besides, the hares' high ambitions obviously contrast sharply with their low status.[55] The *kenning* "Hairy-Feet" by which the hares are typically[56] indicated in Aristotle's allusion may be taken to refer (*pars pro toto*) to their reputation as scaredy-cats: hares are reputed to use their limbs preferably to take to their heels.[57] Finally, and more generally, in fables those who grasp all usually lose all[58]; the hares are unlikely to have fared much better.[59] Joachim Camerarius conjectured that the lions silenced the hares by remarking: "Your words are missing claws and teeth."[60] The humanist's tentative[61]

---

[54] Cf. (with due caution) Schlosser (quoted by Rolfes, E., *Aristoteles' Politik*, Hamburg: Meiner 19804, 319); Buchheit 1986, 145; Demandt 1991, 407.

[55] Cf. e.g. *fab. aes.* 169 Hausrath, Synt. 22, *Syr.* XXIV, 25 Lefèvre (*Aes.* 256).

[56] Wærn 1951, 46, n. 1; cf. Ulbricht 1908, 2. Translation by Perry 1965, 513; Jowett's (Everson's) translation quoted above spoils this effect by substituting the solution for the riddle.

[57] The Hare lives up to his reputation against a Herdsman in Phaedr. *App.* 28 (variant of *Aes.* 22) and against a Wolf in Odo Cer. (*Aes.* 616), but fails to take advantage of his innate fleetness against the Tortoise in *Aes.* 226 (references given above, Achae. 15A1, n. 17); the Hares' defeat of the Frogs in *Aes.* 138 (Babr. 25, *fab. aes.* 143 Hausrath, Aphth. 23 (Nicol. *Prog.* 10), *Syr. XLV* Lefèvre, *Pa.Bodl.* 192 Chambry, *Dod.* ibid., Rom. 35 Thiele, *Tetr.* 1.44; Dähnhardt 1912, 97-103) is a Pyrrhic victory (Babr. 25.4 is telling: μοῦνον εἰδότες φεύγειν).

[58] E.g. *Aes.* 117 (Camel desiring Horns (references given above, Theon, G20c, n. 67), 658 (Hare desiring Horns), 133 (Democr. 47A1); cf. Wienert 1925, 92.

[59] The symbiosis of prey and predators in *Aes.* 334 (see above, n. 53) is utopian.

[60] Interp. p. 132.

[61] Camerarius' Latin may have been modelled upon Plu. *Mor.* 212E and 229C (Perry 1952, 500; cf. *Mor.* 71E, 190F, *Lys.*, 22.3 (445D)), but has been converted into Greek only by Coraës and Halm (*fab. aes.* 241), which has misled several scholars (Denis 1883, 246; Archibald 1912, 78; Jowett 1921; Rackham 1944, 240, n. c; Barker 1948, 135; Handford 1954, 27; Robinson 1962, 46; Tricot 1970, 231, n. 3; García Gual 1978b, 185; Rankin 1986, 140; Stone 1988, 15; Paquet 1990, 41, n. 68; Schütrumpf 1991, 530). Rightly Rosenberg, A., "Aristoteles über Diktatur und Demokratie (Politik Buch III)", *RhM* 82, 1933, 351 (repr. in: Steinmetz, P. [Hrsg.], *Schriften zu den Politika des Aristoteles*, Hildesheim/New York: Olms 1973), 545: "die Antwort..., die man sich denken kann"; Kovacs 1950, 27 (though the Greek is awkward); Meuli 1954a, 756, n. 4; Perry lc (but not 1965, 513), and Jedrkiewicz 1989, 368, n. 67 (but not 1983, 262); cf. Newman 1902, 243.

suppletion has been adopted by many modern commentators, but the classical dictum from George Orwell's *Animal Farm* seems to apply equally well: "All animals are equal, but some are more equal than others."

Although the quondam Antisthenean context[62] of the fable has not been preserved, one again does not have to put up with a *non liquet* in regard to its function. There are good reasons to suppose that Antisthenes somehow applied the fable to politics. This assumption is plausible in view of the application of the allusion to Antisthenes' fable in Aristotle's *Politics*. However, Antisthenes' political application of the fable may have differed from Aristotle's. Although it remains possible that Antisthenes, like Aristotle, applied the fable to men of exceptional stature, it seems more probable that by means of the fable Antisthenes ridiculed the principle of equality adhered to in a democracy, more particularly, in Athens'[63]. Not only is this assumption in accordance with Aristotle's paraphrase, from which it is clear that Antisthenes' fable had a democratic setting (δημηγορούντων) and dealt with a demand of equal rights for all (τὸ ἴσον ἀξιούντων πάντας ἔχειν). Such an application would also have a parallel in another analogy from the animal realm, in which Antisthenes allegedly pointed out the fundamental absurdity (fr. 169 ἄλογον; cf. fr. 100 γελοῖος, fr. 104 ἄτοπον) of Athenian democracy—more particularly, of the democratic principle of electing inexperienced generals rather than appointing the fit—by comparing the essential inequality of asses and horses.[64]

---

[62] Mueller, *De Antisthenis Cynici vita et scriptis*, p. 46 (Susemihl, F.-Hicks, R.D., *The Politics of Aristotle*, London/New Yoık: MacMillan 1894, 415; Ulbricht 1908, 2, n. 1; Archibald 1912, 78; Rankin 1986, 140) supposed that the fable occurred in Antisthenes' *Politicus*, Newman (1902, 243), however, proposed "'Cyrus, or on Kingship'" (mentioned by D.L. 6.1 (16)); cf. Schutrumpf 1991, 530.

[63] Cf. Neubner 1889, 37; Archibald 1912, 78.

[64] Fr. 169 Caizzi (72 Giannantoni) *ap.* D.L. 6.1 (8): συνεβούλευεν Ἀθηναίοις τοὺς ὄνους ἵππους ψηφίσασθαι· ἄλογον δὲ ἡγουμένων "ἀλλὰ μὴν καὶ στρατηγοί, φησί, γίνονται παρ' ὑμῖν μηδὲν μαθόντες, μόνον δὲ χειροτονηθέντες." Cf. Pl. *Phdr.* 260bc (γελοῖον *bis*, παγγέλοιον); Antisth. fr. 104 Caizzi (73 Giannantoni) *ap.* D.L. 6.1 (6), where a plant metaphor (τοῦ...σίτου τὰς αἴρας ἐκλέγειν) is used in a comparable way; Nestle 1944, 315; Rankin, H.D., "Absolute Dog: The Life and Thought of Antisthenes", *PCA* 82, 1985, 17; id. 1986, 139-140; Stone 1988, 15. Cf. Antisthenes' criticism on Athens' demagogues in his Πολιτικός and on Pericles in his Ἀσπασία (frr. 43, 34 Caizzi *ap.* Herodic. fr. 4 During *ap.* Ath. 5, 220D); Brancacci, A., *Oikeios logos. La filosofia del linguaggio di Antistene*, Napoli: Bibliopolis 1990, 156 n. 18, 117 n. 83, comparing "per l'opposizione tra φαῦλοι e σπουδαῖοι" D.L. 6.1 (5, 12; frr. 103, 79 Caizzi).

49. *Plato*

49F1 Pl. *Phd.* 60c: Pleasure, Pain and God (*Aes.* 445)

Plato's *Phaedo* contains a fable[65] about Pleasure and Pain[66], "about how the god[67] wanted[68] to stop their quarrelling[69], and when he couldn't do that, fastened their heads together, and that's why when one comes to a man, the other follows."[70]

The fable is characterized by its ascription[71] to Aesop and terminology (μῦθον), if in a somewhat peculiar way, in that they are part of an *irrealis* (εἰ ἐνενόησεν...Αἴσωπος, μῦθον ἂν συνθεῖναι), which, in its turn, depends on a vacillating μοι δοκεῖ. This cautious presentation of the fable seems to indicate that it is invented for the occasion: "Had Aesop thought of this [but he has not[72]], he would have composed a fable...[which he has not]"; at any rate, Plato's version of this fable is the only one extant[73].

Plato has the fable told by Socrates to his friends who have come to visit him in his death cell. First, and most obviously, the fable has an aetiological function, which is explicitly indicated (καὶ διὰ ταῦτα): it serves to explain why pleasure is inextricably bound up with pain. Socrates himself has just observed and worded this interconnection,

---

[65] Contra Neubner 1889, 35, Nøjgaard 1964, 460, 485, Brisson 1982, 54, Isebaert 1985 (but p 213 "fable") "mythe" (likewise Perry 1962, 301 (but see id 1959, 32), Gaide *ad* Avian G59, Moors 1982, 44), Dareste 1846, 88 "allegorie" (likewise Hartman 1890, 34, cf Hausrath 1909, col 1720), Wienert 1925, 36 "Marchen"/ "Sage[n]"

[66] Not "von den Heuschrecken" (Josifović, 1961, 109, confusing *Phd* and *Phdr*)

[67] ὁ θεός Not necessarily Zeus (contra Wienert 1925, 36), nor "God" (Rutherford 1883, p XXVIII, likewise Reale 1973, 20, Karadagli 1981, 165, Adrados 1987a, 335), see Rowe 1993, 119

[68] βουλόμενος (contra Hartman's "deleatur" (1890, 35, n 1))

[69] αὐτὰ.. πολεμοῦντα The fable is not about "deux ennemis" who are "symbole du plaisir et de la douleur" (Frutiger 1930, 232), but Pleasure and Pain are the belligerents themselves

[70] Translation by Daly 1961a, 240 (Perry 1965, 511)

[71] Plato does not *assert* "che questa attività [di mitologo e di eziologo] sia ritenuta tipica di Esopo" (Jedrkiewicz 1989, 58-59), although one might deduce this

[72] Schauer-Merkle's reading of the implication of the *irrealis* (1992, 90 "Asop erkannte nicht, daß der Tod für einen Weisen etwas Erstrebenswertes ist") seems too close, cf Van Dijk 1994c, 386

[73] This is not to say that "der λογοποιός [Asop] hat uber den Zusammenhang von ἡδύ und λυπηρόν keine Überlegungen angestellt" (Schauer-Merkle 1992, 89-90), as this is the very theme of *fab aes* 13 Hausrath (*Aes* 13), which Adrados (1978b, 44, 1979a, 416, 1987a, 42) suggests is derived from the passage under discussion, cf *Tetr* 2 9 4, see Van Dijk 1994c, 386, 389 n 7

as he is experiencing it in his leg now that he has been untied (Λύουσι, ἄρτι λελυμένον): the fetter caused pain, its removal pleasure.[74] The fable is gradually introduced, as Socrates first suggests that it is with pleasure and pain as though (ὥσπερ) they are tied together, and then narrates the fable. Curiously enough, just before the fable pleasure and pain are imagined to have one head (ἐκ μιᾶς κορυφῆς), but two *in* the fable (τὰς κορυφάς).[75] The resemblance between the fable and its context is indicated by verbal parallels[76]. It is noteworthy that both the fable and its context deal with a member tied up. These are at opposite parts of the body, which corresponds to the opposite event: in the fable imaginary heads are tied up, in the context a real leg has been untied.

At a somewhat higher textual level, the fable is thematically connected with both the preceding and subsequent context. First, the fable is connected with the previous section—the first of Phaedo's narration proper—, in which Phaedo (in exactly the same way as Socrates just before the fable (59a4, 60b3 ἄτοπον)) expresses his astonishment when observing the same mutual relationship (the curious interconnection of pleasure and pain: 59a6 ἀπό τε τῆς ἡδονῆς συγκεκραμένη ὁμοῦ καὶ ἀπὸ τῆς λύπης[77]) in the same situation (visiting Socrates in the face of death) as Socrates when telling the fable (in the first section of his narration proper). Secondly, the fable constitutes a smooth transition to the next section. It almost imperceptibly prepares the way for Socrates' subsequent account of why he has come to versify Aesop's fables (see above): the above fable leads to Cebes' spontaneous apropos (c8-9 Νὴ τὸν Δία..., εὖ γ' ἐποίησας ἀναμνήσας με); his (and particularly Euenus') question (c9-d7) elicits Socrates' elaborate answer (d7-61c1).

The fable is also connected with its context at a yet higher level, the *Phaedo* as a whole, in that it prefigures various notions central to the dialogue. This key function may be compared with the way in which Socrates twice "initiates the resolution of a problem by means of a myth" (62b3-6 "Custody Myth", 70c5-8 "Rebirth Myth")[78].

[74] For a *reductio ad absurdum* of this "alleged inseparability", see Gallop 1975, 76-78.
[75] This has apparently been overlooked by Ellis 1887, 50; Reale 1973, 20.
[76] c. ἐκ μιᾶς κορυφῆς ἡμμένω ~ f. συνῆψεν...τὰς κορυφάς; c.f. τὸ ἕτερον *quater.*
[77] Dorter, K., *Plato's Phaedo. An Interpretation*, Toronto 1982, 5-6, 23-24.
[78] Cobb-Stevens, V., "*Mythos* and *logos* in Plato's *Phaedo*", in: Tymieniecka, A.-T. (ed.), *The Philosophical Reflection of Man in Literature. Selected Papers from Several Conferences Held by the International Society for Phenomenology and Literature in Cambridge, Massachusetts*, Dordrecht/Boston/London: Reidel 1982, 394-399 (not mentioning the fable).

First, the fable prepares for the discussion of the interconnections between opposites (70d-72e, 102b-106e)[79]. The fable instantiates Socrates' later argument that everything results from its opposite (71a ἐξ ἐναντίων τὰ ἐναντία). Just before the fable, Socrates calls pleasure the apparent opposite (τὸ δοκοῦν ἐναντίον εἶναι) of pain; this abstract logical relationship of being each other's apparent opposite finds a concrete representation in the fable, where pleasure and pain are depicted as irreconcilable belligerents (πολεμοῦντα). The fable shows that pleasure and pain only *seem* to be opposites but are actually interconnected.

Secondly, the pair of pleasure and pain, the antagonists of the fable (expressed by adjectives: ἡδύ, λυπηρόν), recurs as a discussion item (expressed by nouns and verbs[80]) in the dialogue, as part of the argument that, on the one hand, the philosopher does not care for these emotions and that they, on the other, tie the soul to the body.

Thirdly, the metaphor of the fable, the tying-up, recurs throughout the dialogue to express the relationship of body and soul, more than once in combination with the couple of pleasure and pain[81]: the body is the soul's prison (σῶμα σῆμα; this dominant image is visualized by Socrates' imprisonment and his leg's fetters), from which it will be freed[82] in the end.

Finally, the fable also introduces the notion of the divine origin of life (and, by implication, death), but the relation is again opposite: in the fable the god binds up pleasure with pain, in the dialogue he ultimately releases our souls from our bodies.[83]

---

[79] Burnet 1911, 14; Schuhl 1947, 44, n. 3; Bal 1950, 6; Friedländer 1960, 34; Robin 1963, pp. XXIIsq; Reale 1973, 20, n. 8; Jedrkiewicz 1983, 258 and 1989, 373-374; Burger R., *The Phaedo: A Platonic Labyrinth*, New Haven/London 1984, 26-27; Schauer-Merkle 1992, 87-88; contra: Gallop 1975, 77; cf. Rowe 1993, 119.

[80] 69a7 ἡδονὰς πρὸς ἡδονὰς καὶ λύπας πρὸς λύπας, 83b6-7 ἡδονῶν...καὶ λυπῶν, 83b8 ἡσθῇ ἢ λυπηθῇ, 83c6-7 ἡσθῆναι ἢ λυπηθῆναι, 83d4 ἡδονὴ καὶ λύπη, 84a4-5 ἡδοναῖς καὶ λύπαις.

[81] 67d1 ὥσπερ δεσμῶν, 82e2 διαδεδεμένην, 82e6 δεδεμένος, 83a1 δεδέσθαι, 83c καταδεῖται; cf. 83e2 προσκεκολλημένην, 83e3 ὥσπερ διὰ εἰργμοῦ (cf. 5), 83d4 ὥσπερ ἧλον ἔχουσα, προσηλοῖ...καὶ προσπερονᾷ (in Burnet's paraphrase (1911, 83, not referring to the fable): "It is pleasure and pain that rivet the fetters of the bodily prison-house").

[82] 65a1 ἀπολύων, 67a6 ἀπολύσῃ, 67d1 ἐκλυομένην, 67d4 λύσις, 67d7, 9 λύειν, 83a3, 84a3 λύειν, 84a4 λυούσης ~ 59e Λύουσι, 60a1 λελυμένον; Gallop 1975, 76.

[83] 60c, 67a6 ὁ θεός; cf. 62b7-8 τὸ θεοὺς εἶναι ἡμῶν τοὺς ἐπιμελουμένους καὶ ἡμᾶς τοὺς ἀνθρώπους ἓν τῶν κτημάτων τοῖς θεοῖς εἶναι (cf. 62d2-3).

49F2 Pl. *Phdr.* 259b-d: Men and Muses (*Aes.* 470)

Plato's *Phaedrus* contains the following fable[84]:

"once upon a time these creatures [*sc.* the cicadas] were men—men of an age before there were any Muses[85]: and [that] when the latter came into the world, and music made its appearance, some of the people of those days were so thrilled with pleasure that they went on singing, and quite forgot to eat and drink until they actually died without noticing it. From them in due course sprang the race of cicadas[86], to which the Muses have granted the boon of needing no sustenance right from their birth, but of singing from the very first, without food or drink, until the day of their death: after which they go and report to the Muses how they severally are paid honour amongst mankind, and by whom. So for those whom they report as having honoured Terpsichore in the dance they win that Muse's favour; for those that worshipped in the rites of love the favour of Erato; and so with all the others, according to the nature of the worship paid to each. The eldest, Calliope, and to her next sister Urania, they tell of those who live a life of philosophy and so do honour to the music of those twain whose theme is the heavens and all the story of gods and men, and whose song is the noblest of all."[87]

The fable is characterized by the typical indefiniteness of narrator (Λέγεται), time (ποτ'[88]) and protagonists (τινὲς; see the Synthesis

[84] 49T9a (Σ) μῦθος.Contra: Neubner 1889, 35; Hackforth (1952, 117), Cook (1985, 436, if admitting that its theme "perhaps recalls Aesop"), Davies-Kathirithamby (1986, 122), Piccone (1992, 261), Gottfried (1993, *passim*): "myth"; likewise Couturat 1896, 41-42; Moutsopoulos, E., *La musique dans l'œuvre de Platon*, Paris: PUF 1959, 7, 116, 386; Karadagli 1981, 181; Brisson 1982, 30; Pinnoy 1986-1987; Pearce 1988, 299; Rodrigo 1992, 270; Frutiger (1930, 181, 233) and Robin (1961, pp. XXXVIsq, 59-60 n. 2) seem, rather confusingly, to use "fable" and "mythe" as synonyms; Wienert 1925, 35: "Marchen"/"Sage[n]"; Friedlander (1954, 202; 1960, 214): "Marchen"; Dareste 1846, 88: "allégorie"; Nøjgaard 1964, 485 (contra Hausrath 1898, 317): "étiologie"; Ferrari 1987, 1: "parable" (but ib. 27: "myth"); Allen 1957, 37: "legend" (likewise Schuhl 1947, 29; Droz 1992, 200 (but ibid. "mythe", ib. 198: "fable").

[85] The theoretical aporia (Herm. ἄτοπον) of human pre-existence was solved by Iamblichus' allegorical interpretation (49T3), identifying the men with "souls who have spent time in the intelligible realm", the Muses with "the heavenly spheres" (Dillon's translation). See Bielmeier, P.A., *Die neuplatonische Phaidrosinterpretation. Ihr Werdegang und ihre Eigenart*, Paderborn: Schoningh 1930, 28; Larsen, B.D., *Jamblique de Chalcis. Exégète et philosophe*, diss. Aarhus: Universitetsforlaget 1972, 372.

[86] Rutherford (1883, p. XXVIII), Ellis (1887, 50), Allen (1957, 37), Cook (1985, 436): "grasshoppers".

[87] Translation by Hackforth 1952, 117-118.

[88] Adrados 1979a, 398-399. Cf. Brisson 1982, 30; Karadagli 1981, 183-184.

above). The fable concurs with ancient traditions about the cicada (see below). Notwithstanding the traditional presentation and appearance, Plato may have invented the fable[89]. The passage at hand is alluded to by Themistius (49T5), whereas Himerius twice (*Or.* 10.6; *Or.* 22 *ap.* Phot. *Bibl.* 243, 373b38-41) refers to the same fable.[90]

Plato has the fable told by Socrates to Phaedrus. In itself, the fable has an aetiological function: it explains why the race of cicadas was granted the divine privilege of being allowed to sing incessantly, without caring for food and drink[91]—ancient Natural History teaches that cicadas feed on nothing but dew[92]. Socrates, however, uses the aetiology to persuade Phaedrus not to stop disputing in the heat (258e7 ἐν τῷ πνίγει)[93]: they are being watched by the cicadas, who will report to their heavenly patronesses, Calliope and Urania, whether or not they—the Muses of Philosophy[94]—are honoured. The cicadas themselves set the tone by debating (259a1 ἀλλήλοις διαλεγόμενοι); if Phaedrus and Socrates follow their lead (2, 7 (μὴ) διαλεγομένους), they might be granted the cicadas' privilege (259b1, c3 γέρας).[95] Hermias, commenting upon the passage (49T6a), however, interprets Plato's fable to rouse the *readers* ("us"), preventing them from dozing off.[96]

At a somewhat higher level, the fable has an important structural

---

[89] Hausrath 1898, 317; Frutiger 1930, 233; Allen 1957, 37; Adrados 1979a, 416; Davies-Kathirithamby 1986, 122.

[90] Contra Adrados 1979a, 416: "sin tradición posterior". For Themistius, see Pohlschmidt, G., *Quaestiones Themistianae*, Diss. Borna: Noske 1908, 32. Gow (1952, 112) compares Theoc. 5.110sq. For Aristopho, fr. 10 *PCG* and Mel. 13 Gow-Page, *AP* 7.196, see the Appendix below.

[91] Not "sans travailler" (Nøjgaard 1964, 544; cf. Lorichium 1542, 21, comparing the "*ignauae...cicadae*" who were the Ants' antagonists in *Aes.* 373 (references given above, Aphth. G54, n. 134).

[92] Cf. Pl. 49T6c (Herm.), 49T9b (Σ); Crane 1986, 273; Davies-Kathirithamby 1986, 123 (noting (ib. 124) that Plato's having the cicadas die "is at odds with another popular notion...that the cicada is not oppressed by old age"); Rowe 1988, 194. Contra: De Vries 1969, 194.

[93] Cf. Thompson 1868, 88; Frutiger 1930, 29; Kovacs 1950, 26-27; Friedländer 1960, 214; Karadagli 1981, 182-188; Crane 1986, 278.

[94] On "Philosophie als Musendienst", see Heitsch, E., "Zwei Bemerkungen zu Platons *Phaidros*", in: Most-Petersmann-Ritter 1993, 180, comparing *Phdr.* 248d, *Phd.* 61a (G3), *R.* 411c, *Ti.* 88c.

[95] Cf. Griswold 1986, 165-166; Rowe 1988, 135.

[96] Likewise Hackforth 1952, 118; Karadagli 1981, 183, n. 2; Görgemanns 1993, 143-144, comparing (referring to Gaiser, K., *Protreptik und Paränese bei Platon*, Stuttgart 1959, 150-187) *La.* 194a, *Phd.* 89d-91c.

function: it marks the transition—as a hinge[97] rather than as a piece of entertainment[98]—from the second to the third part of the dialogue, whose themes (love/Muses[99] and discourse[100]) it echoes and foreshadows. Simultaneously, the key theme itself is foreshadowed in the preceding part[101] and echoed in the subsequent one[102]. This pivotal role is symbolized by the dramatic time: midday[103] (259a2 ἐν μεσημβρίᾳ, 6 μεσημβριάζοντα, d7-8 ἐν τῇ μεσημβρίᾳ). The fable functions as an indirect invocation of the Muses[104] (like the proem to Socrates' first speech (237a8-9 ὦ Μοῦσαι, ᾠδῆς, γένος μουσικὸν ~ 259b-d [Μοῦσαι] *passim*, ᾠδῆς, γένος, μουσικὴν)), as Socrates urges his interlocutor to propitiate the winged mediaries (cicadas ~ philosophers[105]) between man and Muses by broaching a new subject. The fable is comparable also, both thematically (love bringing about death) and structurally (transitional function), with the myth of Boreas and Oreithuia (229b).[106]

Lastly, the cicadas embody the truly philosophic life as Phaedrus himself has just defined it: they care solely for spiritual (music) and not for bodily pleasures (food and drink; cf. Hermias' interpretation (49T6c)): what really matters in life are intellectual pleasures (258e2

---

[97] Robin 1961, p. XXXVII; Griswold 1986, 34, 165; Ferrari 1987, 31; Piccone 1992, 261; Droz 1992, 202; Görgemanns 1993, 142-144; cf. Friedlander 1954, 202; Benardete 1991, 162.

[98] Contra Hackforth 1952, 118; De Vries 1969, 193 (contra: Gottfried 1993, 189).

[99] 259d1 τῇ δὲ Ἐρατοῖ, τοὺς ἐν τοῖς ἐρωτικοῖς ~ Socrates' first (237a-241d) and second speech (243e-257b) *passim*.

[100] 259d6 ἰᾶσι καλλίστην φωνήν ~ e2 καλῶς...λέγειν; Cook 1985, 436.

[101] 230c2-3 ὑπηχεῖ τῷ τῶν τεττίγων χορῷ; Robin 1961, p. XXXIII, p. CXIV, 7 n. 2; Griswold 1986, 165.

[102] 262d2-6 ἴσως δὲ καὶ οἱ τῶν Μουσῶν προφῆται, οἱ ὑπὲρ κεφαλῆς ᾠδοί, ἐπιπεπνευκότες ἂν ἡμῖν εἶεν τοῦτο τὸ γέρας ~ 258e7 ὑπὲρ κεφαλῆς ἡμῶν οἱ τέττιγες, ibid., 259c1 ᾄδοντες, 5 ᾄδειν, b8 ᾠδῆς, 259b1, c3 γέρας; Robin 1961, p. XXXIII; Ferrari 1987, 3, 57; Griswold 1986, 162; Gorgemanns 1993, 132.

[103] Gottfried (1993, 181-182), adducing Theoc. 1.15-18, takes this to refer to Pan's sacrosanct noontime rest and, comparing Socrates' final prayer to Pan (279bc; cf. 263d), accordingly interprets the fable, urging *not* to sleep, as bringing a traditional myth into conformity with Plato's metaphysics. Contra: Görgemanns 1993, 136, more generally regarding "die Zeit der Mittaghitze" as "etwas Unheimliches".

[104] Hackforth 1952, 118; Karadagli 1981, 183, n. 2; Pearce 1988, 299. De Vries (1969, 193, referring to LSJ sv τέττιξ) believes that "at the same time some fun is made of Phaedrus' φιλολογία". Contra: Rowe (1988, 194) and Gottfried (1993, 179, n. 2).

[105] Robin 1961, p. CXIV.

[106] Rodrigo 1992, 269-270.

ἡδονῶν), whereas bodily pleasures (αἱ περὶ τὸ σῶμα ἡδοναί) are "servile" (258e5 ἀνδραποδώδεις; cf. 259a5 ἀνδράποδ' ἄττα).[107] The men actually died from musical joy (259c1 ὑφ' ἡδονῆς), because they totally neglected their bodies (ἠμέλησαν σίτων τε καὶ ποτῶν); their metamorphosis grants them the privilege to continue doing so (259c3-4 μηδὲν τροφῆς δεῖσθαι, ἄσιτόν τε καὶ ἄποτον). Therefore, Socrates addresses Phaedrus as "lover of the Muses" (φιλόμουσον[108]). Phaedrus' confession that he has not heard of it as well as Socrates' (ironical) reproach that he should (ἀνήκοον, -ος) are ambiguous in view of the insects' incessant background music (cf. the title of Ferrari's commentary: *Listening to the cicadas*).

49A1 Pl.[109] *Alc.* I 123a: Fox, Lion and Animals (*Aes.* 142)

In the (First) *Alcibiades* Plato refers to

"what in Aesop's fable the fox said to the lion".

Plato here alludes, as Olympiodorus (49T12a) and the scholiast (Proclus?[110]; 49T8) explain, to the widely-known[111] fable[112] of the Aged Lion[113] who was no longer able to hunt and withdrew to a cave, feigning illness. Many an animal came to visit the sham patient, but all were devoured. Only the fox preferred to keep distant, not through inconsideration, as the lion suggested in a sanctimonious tone of reproach, but rather, as he explained, because he observed visitors' tracks leading into the cave, but not out again. He apparently (and rightly) deduced that venturing into the lion's den was one-way traffic.

---

[107] Jedrkiewicz (1983, 256; 1987, 58; 1989, 372); Isebaert 1985, 210-211; Pinnoy 1986-1987, 109-110.

[108] Cf. De Vries 1969, 193; Griswold 1986, 166.

[109] The authenticity of the dialogue is defended by Vink, C., *Plato's eerste Alcibiades. Een onderzoek naar zijn authenticiteit*, diss. Amsterdam 1939, but disputed by Bos, C.A., *Interpretatie, vaderschap en datering van de Alcibiades Maior*, Culemborg: Tjeenk Willink-Noorduijn 1970 (diss. VU).

[110] Greene *ad loc.*: "fort[asse]."

[111] Lucil. 1074-1083 Krenkel (partially quoted by Porph. *in* Hor. *Ep.* 1.1.74; Non. *Comp. Doctr.* 2 (pp. 182, 209, 236-237 Lindsay), ib. 4 (pp. 446, 471, 538, 646 Lindsay)); Babr. 103 (partially quoted by the *Suda*, α 4155 and σ 938 Adler); Ps.-Dos. 6; *tab. Ass.* 8; Philostr. *VA* 7.30; Aphth. 8; Them. *Or.* 13, 174c; Nicol. *Prog.* 1.1; *fab. aes.* 147 Hausrath; Synt. 37; *Syr.* XXXVII, 63 Lefevre; *Pa.Bodl.* 197 Chambry, *Dod.* ibid.; *Tetr.* 2.2; Rom. 86 Thiele; Thomas Erpenius 6 (Adrados 1987a, 156-158 (incomplete), 485 (medieval versions)); Garbugino 1984; for allusions, see below, n. 114.

[112] Hausrath 1909, col. 1718: "Marchen"; Moors 1982, 36: "myth".

[113] Neubner (1889, 39) asserts that this is the oldest extant mention of a lion in a fable; see, however, above, A. 12F2.

Since Plato only *alludes* to the fable, more particularly to the fox's dictum, it must have been a classic at the time; the many extant allusions[114] from later times witness that it has remained so. The allusion is recognizable as such by its ascription to Aesop as well as by a terminological indication (μῦθος). It might be noted that the use of μῦθος is somewhat peculiar in that it conveys the connotations of both "fable" (κατὰ τὸν Αἰσώπου μῦθον) and "(spoken) word(s)" (ὃν ἡ ἀλώπηξ πρὸς τὸν λέοντα εἶπεν); hence the above translation[115].

Plato has Socrates apply the allusion to the Lacedaemonians' financial management, in order to explain the provenance of Sparta's immense opulence to Alcibiades. This serves to point out to him that his riches pale into absolute insignificance beside theirs (but theirs again beside Persia's (123b)[116]): for many generations gold and silver[117] have been flowing in (εἰσέρχεται) from all Greece and even from abroad, whereas capital outflow (ἐξέρχεται) did not occur.

The close resemblance between the fable and its context is explicitly stated (ἀτεχνῶς; cf. 123a1 καὶ; Olymp. (49T2ab) [πρόσφορος]), and is expressed by continuation of the metaphor of the fable in its context: the money piling up in Sparta is described in terms of animal tracks petering out in the cave (εἰσιόντος μὲν τὰ ἴχνη τὰ ἐκεῖσε τετραμμένα δῆλα, ἐξιόντος δὲ οὐδαμῇ ἄν τις ἴδοι). From this device it is clear that the foreign currency influx in Sparta is compared to the animals[118] who paid a visit to their king's lair: the bank of Sparta is a monetary *cul-de-sac*.

This juxtaposition of fable and context is consequential for both Sparta and Socrates. To begin with, Sparta is implicitly (and subtly (cf. Olymp. (49T12b) χαριέντως)) made to appear in an unfavour-

---

[114] Hor. *Ep.* 1.1.73-75 (*c.* Porph. *ad loc.*), *S.* 2.3.186; Sen. *Ot.* 1.3; Quint. G18b; Plu. *Mor.* 79A; Jo. Chrys. *Hom. in Ac.* 53.5; *Suda*, η 420 Adler; Theod. Metoch. *Misc.* 83 (pp. 546-547 Muller).

[115] Cf. Kovacs 1950, 27; Van Rooijen-Dijkman 1984, 12; Jedrkiewicz 1983, 252 and 1989, 378; see also below, and compare the use of λόγος in S. 13F2 above, as well as λέγε in Ar. 17F3. Nøjgaard 1964, 288), however, translates: "'la fable que le renard dit au lion'".

[116] Following this line of argument, Jedrkiewicz (1983, 253; cf. 1989, 378) interprets Plato's use of the fable as "dimostrazione dialettica della relatività di uno stato di presunta superiorità". For the dialogue's "gewisse Anerkennung...der...Cultur der Barbaren", see Hirzel 1890, 429.

[117] Archibald (1912, 71) and Adrados (1979a, 159) omit the latter.

[118] Not to the lion himself, as Olympiodorus (49T12c) asserts.

able light, as the lion is feeble and old[119], managing to eat his fill only through tricks and devices, which could be interpreted to insinuate that there is something fishy about Sparta's riches. Furthermore, Plato has Socrates implicitly put himself on a par with the fox, the keen observer of the lion's deceit.

In addition, in view of the ambiguity of μῦθος mentioned above on the one hand and the metaphorical association of the lion with Alcibiades as an Alcmaeonid (exploited also by Aristophanes' Aeschylus in 17A6) on the other, the allusion to the fable may also be interpreted to refer to the actual situation of the *Alcibiades* as a dialogue: Socrates is directing (an allusion to) a fable (μῦθος) at Alcibiades, like the fox talked (μῦθον εἶπεν) to the lion.

At a somewhat higher level, the given fable seems an apt illustration of the concluding words (124b3-4) in the present section. At the end of the same long monologue which contained the allusion to the fable, Socrates points out to Alcibiades that he will be able to prevail over (ἂν...περιγενοίμεθα) his rivals (Sparta and Persia) only through diligence and τέχνῃ ("by rules of art"). The polysemy of the latter word might again evoke Aesop's fable previously alluded to, which showed that it was only through his τέχνη (cunning) that the fox survived the lion's (trick[120]).

49A2 Pl. *R.* 2.8, 365c4-6: Ape and Fox (*Aes.* 81)

Plato's *Republic* contains one allusion to a fable:

"...behind me I must have on a leash[121] that cunning, subtle fox of which Archilochus, the greatest of all experts, speaks"[122].

Plato here in all probability alludes to Archilochus' fable[123] of the

---

[119] Olympiodorus (49T12ab) interprets the image to symbolize the impending deterioration of Sparta's aristocracy into an oligarchy, and contrasts the decrepit lion and the eternal youth of Plato's style.

[120] Cf. Aphth. 8.8 τέχνης, *fab. aes.* 147.6 Hausrath τέχνασμα. 122e6 ἀτεχνῶς (but not ἀτέχνως; see Σ *in* Ar. *Pl.* 109) is something different (see above).

[121] ἑλκτέον ἐξόπισθεν, misinterpreted by Adrados (1955, 31) as "el seguir las huellas de la zorra—y mejor aún el dejarla atrás" and by Jedrkiewicz (1989, 376) as "confondere fin la 'volpe'..., illudere l'ingannatore per eccellenza". It might be noted that Them. *Or.* 22, 278d-279a (cf. G57) τὰς ἀλώπεκας ὄπισθεν ἐφελκόμενα seems to refer to the preceding fox fable rather than to Plato's allusion.

[122] Translation by Waterfield, R., *Plato* Republic, Oxford/New York: Oxford UP 1993, 53.

[123] Contra Jedrkiewicz (1983, 251; cf. Adrados 1955, 31), who discusses the allusion as one of those "accenni" which "dato il contesto, sembrano riferirsi a personaggi delle favole, non ad un racconto determinato."

Fox and the Ape[124] (4F2), whose popularity[125] in Classical Athens is also attested by Aristophanes' allusion in *Birds* (17A1); allusions from later times[126] witness that its fame did not dwindle. Plato mentions the author of the given fable by name (unlike Aristophanes (cf. 17T14, 17T17a (Σ) = Archil. 4T23a, 4T24), but like the comedian's mentioning Aeschylus; 17A4 (again in *Birds*)). The fox, to be sure, is the protagonist in yet another fable by Archilochus (4F1), but verbal echoes (Pl. ἀλώπεκα[127] κερδαλεάν ~ Archil. fr. 185.5 ἀλώπηξ κερδαλῆ; Pl. ποικίλην ~ Archil. fr. 185.6 πυκνὸν ἔχουσα νόον) obviously point to the fable in which the ape, not the eagle, was the fox's antagonist. There is an additional argument concerning content: despite the fragmentary state of preservation of Archilochus' two fox fables, it is as good as certain that the fox in one was deceived by the eagle but in the other deceived the ape, whereas in Plato it is clear from the context that the cheater is concerned, not the cheated.

Plato has his brother Adimantus allude to Archilochus' fable in order to illustrate that, in an imaginary young man's—but of course not in Plato's[128]—reasoning, one should play sneaky tricks while making a show of honesty. The fable character *par excellence* to symbolize this ambidexterity is, indeed, the fox, particularly Archilochus' fox, who lured the ape into a trap by pretending to offer him a royal gift. As a matter of fact, this very ape tried to practise Simonides' dictum previously quoted by Plato in the same context ("appearance does violence even to the truth"[129]) but, unlike (if with the help of) the fox, fell short as a poseur: his "appearance" (τὸ δοκεῖν) of a king did not camouflage his "reality" (τὰν ἀλάθειαν) of being just an ape. The epithets of the fox (κερδαλέαν, ποικίλην) do express the qualities in

---

[124] Cf. Luria 1961, 193; Adam-Rees 1963 *ad loc.*; Nøjgaard 1964, 314, 453; García Gual 1970, 420; Karadagli 1981, 136, n. 3; Rosen 1984, 393. Jowett-Campbell (1894, *ad loc.*), Bowra (1940, 28) and Chambry(-Diès) (1959, 60, n. 2) do not commit themselves. Lasserre (1950, 81; id.-Bonnard 1958, fr. 190; contra: Nøjgaard lc), however, pointing to d ἴχνη φέρει (with Adam-Rees 1963 *ad loc.*), takes Plato to allude to the fable of the fox enticing the stag to venture the lion's den (*Aes.* 336).

[125] This is not to say that Köhler (1881, 55) is right in listing the passage under discussion as a proverb.

[126] See above, Archil. 4F2, n. 59.

[127] Not ἀλωπεκῆν (Tim. 49T4, paraphrasing πανουργίαν); see Jowett-Campbell 1894, 73.

[128] Nor in Saint Basil's (Archil. 4T18) τῆς Ἀρχιλόχου ἀλώπεκος τὸ κερδαλέον τε καὶ ποικίλον ζηλώσομεν; Ἀλλ' οὐκ ἔστιν ὃ μᾶλλον φευκτέον τῷ σωφρονοῦντι τοῦ πρὸς δόξαν ζῆν...

[129] Translation by Campbell 1982-1993, III 475; see below, n. 132.

question. In this particular context, Plato's use of Archilochus' epithet (σοφωτάτου) seems somewhat ambiguous (cf. LSJ sv): it obviously expresses the philosopher's admiration[130] for the Parian poet (cf. c1 οἱ σοφοί), but it is noteworthy that σοφός occurs also as an epithet of the fox, denoting (just as κερδάλεος and ποικίλος) his craftiness[131].

The allusion is connected with its context in two respects, as a literary reminiscence and as a type of metaphorical language. In the same section of his speech on the amoral's apparent success, Adimantus refers not only to Archilochus but also to Pindar, Simonides and Homer[132]. He illustrates the contrast between seeming and being not only through the image of the fox but also through metaphors from the realms of architecture, painting, and the road[133]. Plato's quotations from Pindar and Simonides combine both qualities, in that they convey, like the allusion to Archilochus' fable, intertextual metaphors.[134]

49A3 Pl. *Tht.* 200e: Guide and Ford (not in *Aes.*)

Plato's *Theaetetus* contains the following one-sentence narrative:

"The man who had to show where the river was fordable is reported to have said, Go on, and you will find."[135]

This story-in-a-nutshell is much like the kind of metaphorical proverb which, according to Perry[136], is indistinguishable from a fable. The passage under discussion consists of a pre-existing proverbial expression[137] and a concise indication of the situation in which it was

---

[130] Cf. Van Damme, G., *De jakhals in de Oudindische Pañcatantra*, KAWLSK, 1991, 51; differently Von Blumenthal 1922, 8: "ein wenig spottisch"; but cf. Pl. *Ion* 531a.

[131] E.g. Epicur. 54T1 (Max. Tyr.); for other epithets of the fox, see the Final Conclusion below, n. 8.

[132] b3-4 Πότερον δίκᾳ τεῖχος ὕψιον ἢ σκολιαῖς ἀπάταις [= Pi. fr. 201.1-2 Bowra (see also Max. Tyr. 18.1)] ἀναβὰς καὶ ἐμαυτὸν οὕτω περιφράξας διαβιῶ; c1-2 τὸ δοκεῖν...καὶ τὰν ἀλάθειαν βιᾶται = Simon. fr. 93, 598 *PMG ap.* Σ *in* E. *Or.* 235; e4 (see also 364d6-e2) εὐχωλαῖς ἀγανῇσιν = Il. 9.499.

[133] c3-4 πρόθυρα μὲν καὶ σχῆμα κύκλῳ περὶ ἐμαυτὸν σκιαγραφίαν ἀρετῆς περιγραπτέον, d2 ταύτῃ ἰτέον ὡς τὰ ἴχνη...φέρει. See in general Sandbach, F.H., *Plato and the Socratic work of Xenophon*, in: Easterling-Knox 1989, I.3, 80.

[134] Pi. τεῖχος ὕψιον, σκολιαῖς, ἀναβὰς; Simon. βιᾶται (see above, n. 132).

[135] Translation by Campbell 1861, 183.

[136] See above, Chapter I.I, 1.2; cf. Quint. G18b.

[137] Σ (49T10): παροιμία; cf. Pl. *Hp.Ma.* 288b; Cratin. Πυλαία, fr. 188 *PCG ap.* Σ lc.

allegedly used. This situation is narrated more fully[138] by the scholiast (49T11): "When some people came to a river which they wanted to cross, one of them asked the guide whether the water was deep. Whereupon he said: 'It will show'." The fuller form of the fable features typically unspecified protagonists (τινων, τις; like in Pl. 49F2).

Plato has Socrates tell the fable to the dialogue's eponym, Theaetetus. First, the function of the fable is to persuade: Socrates pleads with his interlocutor to examine another definition of knowledge (see below). This function is apparent from Socrates' explanation of the fable in an epimythium, which is typically introduced by an explicit statement of the congruence between the fable and its context (καὶ τοῦτο) and carefully continues the metaphor of the fable: "if we go on [ἰόντες] and search into it, perhaps the very thing we're looking for will come to light at our feet [ἐμπόδιον[139]], but if we stay put [μένουσι], nothing will come clear to us."[140] This multiple continuation of the fable metaphor indicates that the guide represents Socrates. This is suggested also by the very participle καθηγούμενος[141], which is ambiguous in that it refers not only to the guide's concrete *leading* across the river, but also has the connotation of indicating Socrates' more abstract *leading* of the discussion. The equation of the fable's protagonist with its narrator implies that the guide's and Socrates' interlocutor are identical too, i.e. Theaetetus is metaphorically represented by the one/those who want to ford the river. Strictly speaking, the guide seems to address nobody; only the scholiast adds some anonymous travelers. However, two textual signals indicate that it is Theaetetus whom Socrates is addressing through the guide. First, the vocative "Theaetetus" is subtly inserted into the fable; a slight change of the punctuation (the addition of a comma) would

---

[138] Campbell 1861, 183: "The explanation is probable, though the authority is uncertain."; Karadagli 1981, 63.

[139] Campbell 1861, 183: "Those fording the river were feeling the bottom with their *feet*."

[140] Translation (the next one too) by McDowell, J., *Plato. Theaetetus...*, Oxford: Clarendon P 1973, 93.

[141] It should be noted that the participle (like καθηγητής) can also mean "teacher" (D.H. *Amm.* 1.5; id. *Is.* 1, Str. 14.5.14, Plu. *Mor.* 120A (aorist); see LSJ svv), but "du Théétète de son dialogue, Platon a eu bien soin de ne point faire un élève de Socrate", although the *Suda* (θ 93 Adler) thinks he does (Diès, A., *Platon*, VIII.2: *Théétète*, Budé, 1963, 125-126, referring to Sachs, E., *De Theaeteto Atheniensi Mathematico*, Berlin 1914, 10).

have the guide, not Socrates, address Theaetetus![142] Secondly, Socrates' epimythium, which has been seen to continue the metaphor of the fable, uses the first person *plural*.

Lastly, the river in the fable is an image for an issue central to the dialogue. Not only is fathoming the depth of a river an appropriate image for testing a philosophical question (cf. English "sounding"), the parallelism is emphasized also by phraseology (αὐτό *bis*; cf. δείξειν ~ τάχ' ἂν...φήνειε, as well as the continuation of the metaphor discussed above). Moreover, the river metaphor has a structural function, recalling the use of the same metaphor in the fable ascribed to Demades (41F1): the image of a river to be crossed marks a structural *transition*[143] in the dialogue, viz. from the first to a second definition of knowledge to be discussed.[144] On a still higher level, too, Socrates' fable is connected with its context, in that it is one of many metaphors used in the dialogue.[145]

Socrates' miniature fable is successful: Theaetetus replies stylishly, continuing the metaphor of the fable yet further: "Yes, you're right; let's go on [ἴωμεν] and look into it." The second definition of knowledge, however, almost instantly (201a) appears not to stand the test of criticism either.[146]

50. *Xenophon*

50F1 X. *Mem.* 2.7.13-14: Ewe, Sheep, Master, and Dog (*Aes.* 356a)

Xenophon's *Memorabilia* contain one fable, which is first announced as "the fable of the dog[147]" (τὸν τοῦ κυνὸς λόγον) and subsequently narrated *in extenso*:

---

[142] Ὁ τὸν ποταμὸν καθηγούμενος, ὦ Θεαίτητε, ἔφη, ἄρα δείξειν αὐτό.

[143] This happens to be the title given to the present subsection by Bostock, D., *Plato's* Theaetetus, Oxford: Clarendon P 1988, 200.

[144] Knowledge is first defined as perception (151e αἴσθησις), then as true belief (200e ἀληθὴς δόξα); see Cornford, F.M., *Plato's Theory of Knowledge*, London/Henley: Routledge & Kegan Paul 1935 (repr. 1979), 29, 140.

[145] See, in general, Anderson, R.J., *The Dramatic Unity of Plato's* Theaetetus, diss. Yale U 1976, 187.

[146] Heitsch (E., "Überlegungen Platons im Theaetet", *Abhandlungen...Mainz*, 1988.9, 133), referring to Kutschera, however, argues that "Theaitets These...[ist] keineswegs so unangemessen, wie Sokrates und die ihm folgenden Interpreten zu glauben scheinen."

[147] Not "i cani pastori" (Jedrkiewicz 1983, 263; 1987, 56; 1989, 368, 396).

"It is said that when beasts could talk, a sheep said to her master: 'It is strange that you give us sheep nothing but what we get from the land, though we supply you with wool and lambs and cheese, and yet you share your own food with your dog, who supplies you with none of these things.' The dog heard this, and said: 'Of course he does. Do not I keep you from being stolen by thieves, and carried off by wolves? Why, but for my protection you couldn't even feed for fear of being killed.' And so, they say, the sheep admitted the dog's claim to preference."[148]

This fable[149] is recognizable as such by a terminological indication (λόγος) and typical formulae introducing both the fable proper[150] and the epimythium[151]. Xenophon's fable must have enjoyed some popularity, witness Theon's allusion (50T1; G20b). A variant of this fable[152] occurs in the collection of Babrius (128)[153].

Xenophon has the fable told by Socrates[154] to one of his friends, Aristarchus, against the background of the Peloponnesian War. The fable constitutes Socrates' answer when Aristarchus has come to ask

---

[148] Translation by Marchant, E.C.-Todd, O.J., *Xenophon*, IV, Loeb, 1923 (repr. 1979), 155, 157.

[149] For stylistical and structural observations, see Archibald 1912, 72-78; Nøjgaard 1964, 460-461; Adrados 1979a, 403, 408. Nøjgaard's strict structuralist approach (cf. above, Chapter I.I, 1.3), however, leads to some curious conclusions.

[150] ὅτε φωνήεντα ἦν τὰ ζῷα; cf. Call. 20F1.1-3, Ph. *Conf. Ling.* 6, Babr. G19a.5-7, *Vit. Aesop.* 97GW, 99G, 133 GW (Van Dijk 1995b, 139-140, 145; 1996a, 531, n. 57), Max. Tyr. G33, Aimoin. *Vit. Theod.* 1.10 *Eo...in tempore, quo humanae copia eloquentiae cunctis inerat animantibus terrae*; Liv. G11 *tempore quo in homine non ut nunc omnia in unum consentiant, sed singulis membris suum cuique consilium, suus sermo fuerit*; Immisch 1930, 160; Nøjgaard 1964, 412; Adrados 1979a, 223, 263, 399; Karadagli 1981, 99-100; Mombello 1987, 181. Xenophon's fable does *not* contain the typical ποτέ, as Adrados (1979a, 398) contends. For φασὶ, cf. e.g. Simon. 9T3 (*Cod. Par.*), Phaedo 51F1ab; Ibyc. 8T2 (Ael.) ἡ φήμη φησί; Jac. Vitr. (*passim*) *dicitur*. Kovacs 1950, 24; cf. Rutherford 1883, p. XXXV, n. 1. Nøjgaard's argument (1964, 460) that this combination of introductory formulae "semble[nt] naître simplement du peu de familiarité de Xénophon avec le genre fixé qu'était devenue la fable" is not cogent.

[151] καὶ σὺ οὖν; cf. Nøjgaard 1964, 502-503; Adrados 1979a, 384-385; Karadagli 1981, 114; Holzberg 1993, 23.

[152] Denis (1883, 246) thinks that the fable is probably traditional. Kovacs (1950, 24), however, states that "the fable here is obviouly [*sic*] made up for the purpose".

[153] Contra Adrados 1978b, 40; some differences are observed by Nøjgaard (1967, 320, 327). Adrados elsewhere (1987a, 169, 384; cf. 1979a, 416) derives *fab. aes.* 158 Hausrath (*Aes.* 153; see above, D. 40F1, n. 32) and *Pa.Bodl.* 217 Chambry (*Aes.* 342) from Xenophon's fable, but his "probablemente" seems somewhat overconfident. Dalfen (1994/1995, 169) compares Liv. 2.32.9-11 (see above, 44. Alcmaeon, n. 8).

[154] Gerhard (1909, 246, n. 4) considers the fable to be "als Sokratisch...denkbar".

his advice for the second time. Previously, Aristarchus had expounded that he was in a sorry plight because of the war: female relatives had taken refuge with him but he was unable to maintain them (2.7.1-2). Socrates had advised him to make a virtue of necessity by setting them to (fancy)work (3-10). Aristarchus had suited the action to his teacher's word and bought wool (11-12). Now he has returned to make a delightful report (12 χαίρων) of the ladies' metamorphosis from boarders to breadwinners. But he adds that Socrates' solution has raised a new problem: the newborn workhorses now accuse *him* of parasitism. To that Socrates advises him to tell them the above fable.

Through verbal parallels and an explicit comparison it is clear that Socrates represents Aristarchus and his female relatives in the fable by the dog and the sheep, respectively. To begin with, in the epimythium Socrates unmistakably indicates that the dog stands for Aristarchus: they are explicitly equated (ἀντὶ κυνὸς εἶ φύλαξ), and both are said to "watch" (c. φύλαξ ~ f. προφυλάττοιμι). Textual signals make the parallelism between the women and the sheep evident, too. Both have "wool" (c.f. ἔρια)—as raw material and produce, respectively—, meet with difficulties in "getting" food "from the land" (c. 2 λαμβάνομεν δὲ οὔτε ἐκ τῆς γῆς οὐδέν [Aristarchus] ~ f. 13 ἡμῖν...οὐδὲν δίδως ὅ,τι ἂν μὴ ἐκ τῆς γῆς λάβωμεν [the sheep]) and are in peril of "death" (c. 2 ἀπολλυμένους ~ f. 14 ἀπόλησθε). Besides, these two parallels are obvious because the fable characters' gender[155] and number apply also to their alter egos: in the fable as well as in the context a male individual has to defend himself against a female group by pointing out that he protects them. Obviously, the very selection of the fable characters[156] serves both to criticize the women and to rehabilitate Aristarchus, as the former are stereotyped as sheepish, whereas the latter is portrayed as a Cerberus.[157]

The similarity between the fable and its context is yet closer.[158] At first sight, the structure of the fable is somewhat curious: the sheep

[155] Archibald 1912, 77.

[156] Cf. Pugliarello 1973, 68 (dog), 127 (sheep); for the latter, cf. e.g. Nicol. G64a τὰ δὲ πρόβατα εὐήθη καὶ μεστὰ ἀνοίας (*sc.* φθέγγηται)· τοιαύτη γάρ τις ἡ... φύσις.

[157] This is not to say that the fable is "une justification de l'armée" (Mainoldi 1984, 203).

[158] Contra Gigon 1956, 179 (noticing only the wool as common denominator): "Sehen wir indessen naher hin, so hort die Uebereinstimmung befremdlich rasch auf. (...) Fabel und Realitat harmonieren denkbar schlecht."

complain to their master about the dog, but it is the dog who answers them, whereas the master has gone out of sight. This apparent inconsistency[159] is actually functional. Xenophon thus opposes the indirect question to the direct answer: Aristarchus voices his housemates' complaints to Socrates, whereas the latter urges Aristarchus to speak to them himself. In other words, the discontented party's complaints are uttered through an intermediary, whereas the accused defends himself. This implies that Socrates, Aristarchus' teacher, represents himself by the sheep's (and the dog's) master in the fable.[160] It might not be just a coincidence that Xenophon has Socrates, who, according to Plato, was in the habit of swearing "to the dog"[161], select a fable with a canine protagonist. As a matter of fact, the fable does contain a dog's oath, though of another kind: it is the dog who swears "to Zeus" (μὰ Δί').[162] As regards the remaining unknown of the equation, the reader is invited to identify the lurking thieves and wolves with the Lacedaemonian enemy, which is of course not exactly a point in their favour.

The function of the fable is twofold. First, the very telling of the fable constitutes Socrates' advice to the problem presented by Aristarchus. This is indicated both in the fable and in the epimythium (Εἶτ' οὐ λέγεις; λέγε). Secondly, the fable tries to dispose of the women's objections to Aristarchus' *dolce far niente*[163]. This goes *a maiore*, as the women do not seem to have an equal voice with the sheep: the latter, producing food (τυρὸν), are useful by nature, whereas the former have only recently become so on the initiative of Aristarchus (acting on Socrates' advice) (9, 12 ὠφελίμους; cf. 5, 7, 8 χρήσιμα; 10

---

[159] To which Nøjgaard (1964, 460-461) objects prohibitively.

[160] Strauss (1972, 52-53) does not answer the question "who corresponds to the silent master?" According to Gigon (1956, 179), Aristarchus could "doch wohl beanspruchen..., Herr und Hund in einer Person zu sein".

[161] νὴ/μὰ τὸν κύνα Pl. *Ap.* 22a *c.* Σ *ad loc.* (p. 5 Greene), *Grg.* 482b; LSJ sv κύων.

[162] Strauss 1972, 53. Joel (1901, II 1027-1028) interprets the "Verherrlichung des κύων" as a eulogy of Antisthenean Cynicism.

[163] It is not an aetiological fable, as Nøjgaard (1964, 461, 501) and Adrados (1979a, 263) deduce from οὕτω δὴ λέγεται καὶ τὰ πρόβατα συγχωρῆσαι τὸν κύνα προτιμᾶσθαι: the two articles are restrictive, not amplifying, as they refer to the concrete protagonists of this specific fable, not to the two species in general. Nor does the fable "point a generalized moral lesson" as Daly asserts (1961a, 14): its application is specific, its function persuasive. Chroust (1957, 95) does *not* mention the fable, which seems to take the edge off his argument that "the purpose of the Aristarchus story...is to disprove the allegation [in Polycrates' *Κατηγορία Σωκράτους*] that Socrates was...an advoate of a life of idleness."

λυσιτελήσει); before, they took the bread out of his mouth. This slight incongruity between fable and context implies that if the sheep admitted themselves to be in the wrong, all the more should the women. Neither Aristarchus' nor the women's reaction is reported by Xenophon, but Socrates' fable subtly prevails upon both to react positively: the dog is said to "speak after having listened" (ἀκού-σαντα εἰπεῖν), and the sheep to "admit" (συγχωρῆσαι).

The fable is also connected with its context at a higher level. Aristarchus is just one in a queue of men obtaining advice from Socrates (2.2 Lamprocles; 2.3-4 Chaerecrates; 2.5 some careless friend; 2.6 Critobulus; 2.7 Aristarchus; 2.8 Eutherus; 2.9 Criton; 2.10 Diodorus). To some of these Socrates adduces arguments from, among other things, animal metaphors, and twice even uses the sheep dog theme (one also includes wolves fended off)[164]. Most belong to the type of the Socratic comparison[165] grouped by Aristotle (G5) together with fables (λόγοι) among the fictitious exempla. Thus the fable is presented as a typical ingredient of Socrates' dialectics.

51. *Phaedo*

51F1ab Phaedo, *Zopyr.* fr. 1 Rossetti (11 Giannantoni) *ap.* Theon. *Prog.* 3: King's Son and Lion's Cub (not in *Aes.*[166])

Theon (51T1ab; G20c) quotes two fragments of a fable[167] from Phaedo's *Zopyrus*:

"...the youngest son of the king befriended a lion's cub."

"...the lion, since it was raised with[168] the boy, accompanied him

[164] 2.3.9 κύνα μέν, εἴ σοι ἦν ἐπὶ προβάτοις ἐπιτήδειος ὢν καὶ τοὺς ποιμένας ἠσπάζετο, σοὶ δὲ προσιόντι ἐχαλέπαινεν, ἀμελήσας ἂν τοῦ ὀργίζεσθαι ἐπειρῶ εὖ ποιήσας πραΰνειν αὐτόν; 2.9.2 κύνας δὲ τρέφεις, ἵνα σοι τοὺς λύκους ἀπὸ τῶν προβάτων ἀπερύκωσι; ib.7 ὥσπερ ὅταν νομεὺς ἀγαθὸν κύνα ἔχῃ, καὶ οἱ ἄλλοι νομεῖς βούλονται πλησίον αὐτοῦ τὰς ἀγέλας ἱστάναι, ἵνα τοῦ κυνὸς ἀπολαύωσιν... (cf. Joel 1901, II 1028; Gigon 1956, 180, 185, 187; Strauss 1972, 53-54). Cf. 2.2.7 θηρίου ἀγριότητα; 2.4.5 ἵππος, ζεῦγος; 2.6.7 ἵπποις; 2.6.9 οὐ κατὰ πόδας ὥσπερ ὁ λαγῶς οὐδ' ἀπάτῃ ὥσπερ αἱ ὄρνιθες οὐδὲ βίᾳ ὥσπερ οἱ ἐχθροί [MSS: κάπροι Ernesti, Sauppe].

[165] Contra Gigon (1956, 180), who considers 2.9.2 to be "eine Anspielung auf unsere Fabel"; see the Appendix below.

[166] See Van Dijk 1994a, 103, 108.

[167] Frutiger (1930, 232, n. 6) terms it a "mythe".

[168] σύντροφος; LSJ sv: "freq. of domestic animals"; cf. e.g. Arist. *HA* 8(9).44, 629b11 (of the lion). Rossetti (1980, 185) turns the lion into a "guardia del corpo".

wherever he went after he became a young man. Consequently, the Persians said that the lion loved the boy..."[169]

Theon explicitly terms this a "fable" (μῦθος). The relegation of the fable to some unspecified instance (φασὶ; cf. X. 50F1) as well as the indefiniteness of its leonine protagonist (τινι) can be considered to be typical of the genre (see the Synthesis above). The Persian *couleur locale* (βασιλέως without article, οἱ...Πέρσαι), however, is not.

It is clear that the fable brought together—also on a linguistic level: βασιλέως υἱὸν ~ λέοντος σκύμνῳ—two royal scions of different realms, but how their companionship ended (τὰ ἑξῆς) cannot be ascertained, as other fragments of Phaedo's fable do not survive. A connection with Aeschylus' fable of the Man who reared a Lion's Cub in his house (A. 12F2; Ar. 17A6) is tempting but purely speculative. Theon (G20c) abruptly cuts off his second quote ("*et cetera*"), as he needs only its first words: he adduces the fable as an example worthy of imitation, in that Phaedo varies—as any fabulist should—the grammatical cases[170] of its characters; this the fragments do exemplify: the first fragment is in the accusative (ἀπὸ τῆς αἰτιατικῆς: τὸν υἱὸν), the second changes over to the nominative (μετέβαλεν εἰς τὴν εὐθεῖαν: ὁ λέων). Theon does give information about the relative position of the fragments within the fable: the first was "its *incipit*" (τὴν...ἀρχὴν), the second occurred "a little *infra*" (μικρὸν ὑποβὰς), whereas the remaining part must have been of some length (καὶ τὰ ἑξῆς).

The two fragments quoted by Theon give, for all their brevity, some information about the fable's context: Phaedo had someone (μοι) tell the fable to Socrates (ὦ Σώκρατες) and (feign to) proceed somewhat cautiously (δοκεῖ[171]). The most likely candidate for Socrates' anonymous interlocutor is Zopyrus, the dialogue's eponym.[172] The Persian setting of the fable (see above) seems to be a case in point, as Zopyrus was from Syria, which was a Persian satrapy at the time[173].

---

[169] Translations by Butts 1987, 265. Rossetti (1980, 184, n. 6) rightly defends Theon's text against Von Wilamowitz-Möllendorff (U., "Phaidon von Elis", *Hermes* 14, 1879, 476) and Camerarius.

[170] This is not tantamount to a recommendation to alternate indirect and direct speech, as Rossetti (1980, 184, n. 7) seems to understand.

[171] Rossetti 1980, 184, n. 7, contra Von Wilamowitz-Möllendorff (lc), who "emended" καί μοι δοκεῖ into κἀμεμαθήκειν "um wenigstens Mögliches zu geben".

[172] Rossetti 1980, 185.

[173] See e.g. Rösler, W., "Syria", *DKP* 5, col. 471.

As the direct context of the fable has not been preserved, attempts to ascertain its quondam function perforce remain tentative. It is unclear how, if at all, the fable is to be connected with the one thing which it is clear[174] that the dialogue was about: the character faults which Zopyrus read from Socrates' lineaments (frr. 6-22 Rossetti). Perhaps[175] the fable about the boy-loving lion is to be connected with the pederasty which the physiognomist observed in Socrates by ophthalmoscopy (fr. 11 Rossetti[176] παιδεραστοῦ ~ fr. 1 ἐρᾶν...τοῦ παιδὸς). Building upon this hypothesis, the first verb of the fragment under discussion (χαρίσασθαι[177]) may well be interpreted to have a (homo)erotic connotation.

52. *Aristotle*[178]

52A1 Arist. *Pol.* 3.13, 1284a15-17: Lions and Hares (*Aes.* 450)

Aristotle in his *Politics* alludes to Antisthenes' fable of the Lions and the Hares discussed above (48F1). The fable must have been on everybody's lips[179], for Aristotle refrains from quoting *verbatim* the lions' retort to the hares' demand, although it is vital to his argument; he actually reasons with the lions' words without pronouncing them (λέγοιεν...ἂν...ἅπερ 'Αντισθένης ἔφη τοὺς λέοντας...). The characteristic *kenning* of the hares (see above, Antisth. 48F1) only adds to the

[174] Cf. Dörrie, H., "Phaidon", *DKP* 4, col. 691-692; Engel, R., "Zopyrus" (3), *DKP* 5, col. 1560.

[175] Rossetti (1980, 185) suggests that the fable "si inquadri nell'ambito di un confronto fra la παιδεία ellenica (o più specificamente socratica) e quella dei saggi (o presunti saggi) orientali"; cf. Hirzel 1890, 421.

[176] *Ap.* Cassian. *Conlat.* 13.5.3: *...cum intuens eum quidam physiognomon dixisset:* ὄμματα παιδεραστοῦ, *hoc est oculi corruptoris puerorum, et inruentes in eum discipuli inlatum magistro vellent ultum ire convicium, indignationem eorum hac dicitur compressisse sententia:* παύσασθε, ἑταῖροι· εἰμὶ γάρ, ἐπέχω δέ, *id est: quiescite, o sodales: etenim sum, sed contineo.*

[177] Cf. Pl. *Smp.* 182a, *Phdr.* 231c, 256a; X. *Mem.* 3.11.12; LSJ sv χαρίζω 3.: "in erotic sense, *grant favours* to a man"; it may be noted that Plato and Xenophon are, just like Phaedo, pupils of Socrates.

[178] See also above, Arist. 34F/A1, 39F1-2; below Arist. 57F1, 57A1-2.

[179] Cf. Aalders, G.J.D., "Die Mischverfassung und ihre historische Dokumentation in den *Politica* des Aristoteles", in: *La 'Politique' d'Aristote*, Genève: Fondation Hardt 1965, 224.

somewhat enigmatic character[180] of Aristotle's allusion to Antisthenes' fable.

Aristotle alludes to the fable in order to illustrate his preceding argument that trying to legislate for men of exceptional stature is ridiculous (γελοῖος ἂν εἴη) and unjust (ἀδικήσονται), since legislation exists only among equals (περὶ τοὺς ἴσους); as such men are unequal (ἄνισοι...ὄντες), they are above, nay, they *are*, the law (αὐτοὶ γάρ εἰσι νόμος). Verbal parallels[181] indicate that the hares in the fable represent those who try to legislate for unequal persons. This implies that the lions stand for those outstanding men. The fable characters are perfectly in accordance with this application, in view of the inferior status of hares (see again Antisth. 48F1) and the regal status of lions: the lion is the king[182] of nature, whereas Aristotle is talking about natural kingship[183].

The fable links up closely with its context by virtue of its political (more specifically, democratic) setting: the hares (as well as the lions) address a deliberative assembly (16 δημηγορούντων ~ 18 δημοκρατούμεναι). It seems noteworthy that the use of the adverb ἴσως (15) "probably", which introduces the allusion to Antisthenes' fable, is somewhat ambiguous, as in the surrounding context various forms of the corresponding adjective (and, once, the substantive) occur to express the notion central to both the fable and its context, viz.

---

[180] But δασύποδας and λαγὼς are used as synonyms in Arist. *HA* 8(9).32, 619b1 and 10.

[181] c. 16-17 τὸ ἴσον ἀξιούντων ~ f. 9 ἀξιούμενοι τῶν ἴσων; 16 δημηγορούντων ~ c. 18 δημοκρατούμεναι. Translation by Rackham 1944, 243.

[182] Phaedr. 1.5.7 *quia rex cluo*; id. 4.14 *in tit. De leone regnante* (*Aes.* 514); Babr. 67.6 βασιλεὺς γάρ εἰμι; id. 102.1 Λέων τις ἐβασίλευεν; *fab. aes.* 147 Hausrath (II) κύριε; *Dod.* 197.15 Chambry Μέδων; ib. 201.1 Λέων ὁ μέγας; ib. 338.3 Ἄναξ...ὁ λέων; *Tetr.* 1.41.3 ἄναξ; Nøjgaard 1964, 314; Goetz-Stankiewicz, M., "The Fable and Power Play: Thoughts on a Recurring Theme", in: Dissanayake, W.-Bradbury, S. (eds.), *Literary History, Narrative, and Culture*, Honolulu: U of Hawaii P 1989, 93: "*le roi soleil*".

[183] It has been suggested that in the passage under discussion Aristotle refers to Philip (Raubitschek 1986, 169) or Alexander (Keyt, D., "Aristotle's Theory of Distributive Justice", in: id.-Miller 1991, 239, referring to Kelsen, H., "The Philosophy of Aristotle and the Hellenic-Macedonian Policy", *International Journal of Ethics* 48, 1937, 37), but this is disputed (e.g. by Bradley, A.C., "Aristotle's Conception of the State", in: Keyt-Miller 1991, 13-56 (repr. from *Hellenica*, ed. Abbott, E., London 1880 (repr. 1971), 53, n. 27; Merlan 1954-1955, 80, n. 1; Schütrumpf 1991, 528-530). *If* Aristotle did, the image of the lion would have been to the point (cf. *Vit. Alex.* Γ 3.19; Demad. fr. 51 De Falco *ap.* Plu. *Dem.* 23.6; id. *Alex.* 2.2-3, 13; Ephor. *FGrHist*70F217 *ap.* Tert. *An.* 46; Van Dijk 1996a, 529).

(un)equality (9 ἴσων, 10 ἄνισοι, 12 ἴσους, 17 ἴσον; 20 ἰσότητα); as a matter of fact, the adverb does occur twice in this sense (ἴσως "equally"[184]) in the preceding paragraph (1283b40-41)—if, admittedly, not in combination with an *optativus potentialis*.

The fable is also connected with its context at a somewhat higher level: the fable is preceded by one comparison and followed by one mythological (μυθολογεῖται) and one historical example, which all, like the fable, serve to illustrate the fundamental difference between outstanding men and their fellow citizens. The unbridgeable gap between the lions and the hares in Antisthenes' fable has a parallel in the opposition between "a god among men"[185] (ὥσπερ...θεὸν ἐν ἀνθρώποις), between Heracles and the Argonauts (22-25), and between the outstanding ears and the rest of the corn (26-33). Democracies simply, but drastically, narrow the gap by ostracizing[186] citizens who rise above the crowd, but Aristotle holds that the truly exceptional man should be appointed king.

53. *Menedemus of Eretria*

53A1 Menedemus Eretr. *ap.* D.L. 2.17 (133), Erasm. *Adag.* 1.7.68: Tortoise/Turtle and Eagle (cf. *Aes.* 226?)

Diogenes Laertius (53T1) reports from an unspecified source that Menedemus of Eretria used to quote a distich from Achaeus' *Omphale*, which has been seen (15A1) probably to allude to a fable about a tortoise (or a turtle) beating an eagle. As a matter of fact, this is a fourth-degree allusion, four different authors (including an anonym) alluding to one fable! Regrettably, however, Diogenes is the only extant source. Yet, the function of Menedemus' allusion can somewhat (if tentatively, perforce) be clarified. Menedemus appears to have given the allusion a different[187] application than Achaeus: the

[184] Rackham 1944, 241; Barker 1948, 135; cf. Jowett 1921; Tricot 1970, 230, n. 4; Schutrumpf 1991, 524, 530. Robinson (1962, 45), however, translates "perhaps".

[185] Merlan 1954-1955, 80, n. 1; Raubitschek 1986, 169.

[186] Schutrumpf 1991, 531: "Herstellung von Gleichheit, also...die Verwirklichung des Anspruches der Hasen gegen die Lowen". Likewise, Periander advised Thrasybulus (not *vice versa* as in Hdt. 5.92; see the Appendix below) to level the corn-field by rigorously cutting off all outstanding ears.

[187] Contra Neubner 1889, 34-35, thinking it to be "ueri simillimum" that it was "nec...dispar".

latter probably somehow applied it to the mythical subject matter of his satyr play, whereas the former is said to have had a habit of (whether or not ironically; see Erasmus (53T2)) quoting the distich "against his political opponents"[188]. It seems plausible to deduce that these rival politicians were metaphorically represented in the fable targeted at them[189], more particularly by the one who came off worst: the eagle; the subsequent assumption that the victorious tortoise (turtle) stood for the eristic himself seems natural.

At a higher level, the allusion to Achaeus' allusion fits into its context in that it exemplifies the great esteem in which Menedemus held his fellow townsman as a satyric poet[190], in (Diogenes' account of) his view ranking second to none but Aeschylus[191] (133). At a still higher level, Diogenes uses the anecdote of Menedemus' political application of the playwright's allusion to illustrate that the philosopher was a man of wider reading than it is rumoured by some[192] (134).

54. *Epicurus*

54 Epicur. *ap.* Max. Tyr. 32.1-2: Stag, Lion, Shepherd, and Fox (*Aes.* 22)

Maximus of Tyre (54T1; G34) suggests that Epicurus might have used (Δοκεῖ μοι...χρήσασθαι ἂν) the fable of the shepherd who was reproached by a fox for being both cowardly and mean, because he had signalled the hiding place of a stag to a lion, who asked him whether he had seen it hide (which he had), whereas he had *said* not to.

Other versions of this fable are extant in various collections[193], but

---

[188] Translation by Hicks 1925, I 265.

[189] For Menedemus' political activity and antagonists, cf. D.L. 131 πολιτεύεται, 141 ἀντιπολιτευομένων. For his pugnacity, cf. ib. 134 δυσανταγώνιστος, ἐριστικώτατος, 136 μάχιμος.

[190] The philosopher, in his turn, was paid a tribute by his friend Lycophron in the latter's satyr play *Menedemus* (*TragGrF*100F2-4; D.L. 133, 140).

[191] One of Menedemus' very political opponents happens to be the tragic poet's namesake (D.L. 141).

[192] οἱ λέγοντες, according to Crönert (1906, 10) perhaps including Heraclides (Ponticus).

[193] Phaedr. *App.* 28, Babr. 50, *fab. aes.* 22 Hausrath, Rom. 73 Thiele, Leonardo Dati 16.

Maximus' version differs in that it (1) increases the number of characters from three to four, (2) replaces two characters (both the pursuer and the pursued) with others, (3) changes the part of the fox from protagonist to *survenant*, and (4) omits the dialogue in which the Judas sanctimoniously promises the prey not to betray it to its pursuer.[194]

These variations can be accounted for by a close examination of the philosophical application of the fable.[195] Maximus imagines that Epicurus could have applied the fable to those who betray (τὸν κατήγορον) pleasure, keeping a stiff upper lip but thinking about it on the sly. Maximus explicitly compares the shepherd's beckoning hand to man's longing mind (τῇ δὲ γνώμῃ, καθάπερ τῇ χειρί); the former's half answer symbolizes the latter's hypocrisy. This implies that the shepherd and the stag metaphorically represent man and pleasure respectively, as is also clear from a verbal parallel, which continues the image of the fable into its context: Maximus censures those who "stretch out" their minds (as though they were hands) towards pleasure[196]. Another instance of such a continuation of the fable metaphor subtly indicates what the lion stands for. When Maximus says that men "pursue"[197] all kinds of things, it becomes clear that the predator's big game hunt is an image for man's irrepressible inclination towards hedonism (cf. τὸ μόνον δὴ πραγμάτων τῇ αὑτοῦ φύσει ἐπαγωγότατον). The meeting of the shepherd and the lion thus metaphorically represents a twofaced weakling's moral dilemma (cf. Τίς γὰρ οὕτω πολεμήσαιτο ἑαυτῷ, ὥστε...;). The fox, uttering the *réplique finale*, is the philosopher's (Maximus' and, in his view, Epicurus') mouthpiece, being on to the dissembler (cf. Pl. 49A1-2).

Whether or not the tentative ascription of the fable to Epicurus is

[194] In the Latin versions a Herdsman betrays a Hare (*lepus*: Phaedrus) or a Wolf (*lupus*: Romulus) to a Hunter, in the Greek versions (Babrius, [Aesop]) a Woodcutter betrays a Fox to Hunters; see Krohn, K., *Mann und Fuchs. Drei vergleichende Märchenstudien*, Helsingfors 1891 (*non vidi*); Getzlaff 1907, 38-40 contra Christoffersson 1901, 47-48; Nøjgaard 1967, 377-379; Schwarzbaum 1979, 379-382; Adrados 1987a, 49-50 (comparing Phaedr. 2.8, Rom. 69 Thiele (*Aes.* 492; Adrados 1987a, 359-360, 452 (medieval versions))), 495-496 (medieval versions, for which see also Dicke-Grubmuller 1987, 704-707).

[195] Contra Getzlaff 1907, 39-40, n. 2, who condemns them as "in peius versa".

[196] c. ἐκτεινόμενον (man-pleasure) ~ f. ἀποτείνας (shepherd-stag); cf. ὀρέγω, Dutch "haken".

[197] c. διώκεται (men-appetites/ambitions) ~ f. διώκεται (lion-stag).

Maximus' concoction[198], we may agree with the latter that the fable would indeed have fitted well into the former's hedonistic doctrine.[199]

55. *Hieronymus Rhodius*

55A1 Hieronym. Rhod. fr. 35 Wehrli *ap.* Ath. 13.82, 604D-F
In all probability Hieronymus of Rhodes' *Historical Notes* comprised not only Sophocles' love affair reported by Athenaeus (55T1) but also the epigram which the tragedian allegedly composed in this connection and which alludes to the fable of Helios and Boreas. Both the function of Sophocles' allusion in its tragicomic context and the reliability of Hieronymus' testimony have already been discussed above (S. 24A1).

56. *Chrysippus*

56A1 Chrysipp. Stoic. fr. 180.14 *SVF*: Ass and Snake (*Aes.* 458)
Chrysippus in his *Negatives* seems to quote from Ibycus' fable (8F1) of the Ass and the Snake. The Stoic philosopher cites the fragments four times as part of a logical argument, a *reductio ad absurdum* of the negation of man's immortality: Ibycus' negative proposition presupposes an affirmative one[200] (ἀξίωμα καταφατικόν), but, as the latter is nonexistent (οὐ ἀντίκειται), the former is impossible, too.

Conclusion

The very fact that fables are (or: are said to have been) adduced by philosophers representing, or adhering to, diverse schools of thought once again illustrates the genre's remarkable malleability.

---

[198] Cf. Archibald 1912, 79.

[199] Usener (H., *Epicurea*, Leipzig: Teubner 1887 (repr. Stuttgart 1966)) includes Max. Tyr. ib.3 as fr. 443* ("De voluptate et dolore recte aestimandi"), and (unlike Bailey, C., *Epicurus. The Extant Remains*, Oxford: Clarendon P 1926 (repr. Hildesheim/Zurich/New York: Olms 1989; contra Van Dijk 1993a, 30; 1995a, 248, n. 37) mentions the passage under consideration under fr. 398 ("De summo bono et malo").

[200] For a discussion and some examples of Chrysippus' propositional logic, see, e.g., Bréhier, E., *Chrysippe et l'ancien Stoïcisme*, Paris: PUF 1951², 68-79; Gould, J.B., *The Philosophy of Chrysippus*, Leiden: Brill 1970, 66-88.

Although the quondam contexts of both Democritus' allusion and Antiphon's fable do not survive, they fit well in the broader context of these philosophers' ethics. Both present the examples set by the protagonists of the fables in question as unworthy of imitation. The way in which they do so, however, is completely different, in terms of both form and content. The fable in question is only hinted at by Democritus, and expatiated by Antiphon, but the former's allusion, brief though it is, is clear enough, whereas the deceptive straightforwardness of the latter's lengthy fable is rich in double, or even multiple, relevant meanings. Democritus clarifies the analogy between the fable and its context by an explicit comparison, Antiphon by verbal parallels and evaluative clues in an epimythium. As a matter of fact, Democritus' allusion dissuades from craving to increase one's possessions, Antiphon's fable from failing to do so.

Three philosophers whose works (if any) do not contain one single fable are nevertheless mentioned as fabulists. The mention of Alcmaeon as the genre's inventor by three Latin writers on (or across) the threshold of the Middle Ages can be connected with other fragments, but the philosopher's name may just be a corruption of the name of Loqman, the "Arab Aesop". Socrates' alleged Aesopic versification (cf. Socr. 25F1) can be connected with other passages, notably with the fables which two Socratics (Plato (twice) and Xenophon) put into their teacher's mouth (cf. the fable which Phaedo has told *to* him; see below), but may equally well be understood as a literary motive in Plato's *Phaedo*, illustrating the condemned man's equanimity and innocence. Maximus Tyrius' tentative ascription of a fable to Epicurus is isolated.

Although neither Antisthenes' fable nor its context is extant, its quondam context was probably comparable, but its function not identical, with that of Aristotle's allusion to it. In both instances, the selection of the fable characters in the (supposed) political context is to the point. Aristotle indicates the analogy between the given fable and its context by verbal parallels (and perhaps, in addition, intrusion of the context into the allusion). The rhetorical setting of Aristotle's allusion recalls not only his general advice (G5) that the use of fables is particularly appropriate in deliberative assemblies, but also his two exemplifications (39F1-2), as well as his Aesopic allusion (34A1).

Four fables and two allusions are connected with Socrates.[201] The

[201] One might add the allusion by Menedemus, belonging to Phaedo's school (D.L. 2.9 (105), 17 (125)).

fable from the *Phaedo* is connected with Socrates' alleged Aesopic versification. Two fables and the two allusions are told by Socrates to the respective dialogue's eponyms (Phaedo, Phaedrus; Alcibiades, Theaetetus). Phaedo's fable, conversely, is told by the dialogue's eponym (Zopyrus) to Socrates, whereas Xenophon has Socrates tell a fable to a friend of his (Aristarchus).

The two (apparently truly) Platonic fables are remarkably similar in that both are aetiologies (although the *Phaedrus* fable (like Ar. 17F6) is told to persuade and have, like myths occurring in the same dialogues, various important structural connections with their contexts at a higher level. The fable from *Phaedo* prefigures several of the dialogue's central concepts; the one from *Phaedrus* marks the transition between its second and third parts, with which it is interconnected. In addition, the first fable serves to introduce the account of Socrates' versification of Aesop's fables, whereas the protagonists of the second fable serve as a philosophic model for the principal persons of the dialogue.

Of Plato's three allusions, one (49A3) is comparable with his two fables, particularly with the second one, in that its function is both persuasive and transitional. This transitional function is symbolized by the very scene of the action (ford); likewise, that of the second fable is indicated by the very time of the action (noon). Plato's other two allusions (49A1-2) have a different function but are comparable with each other. Both allude to a fox fable whose protagonist is praised for seeing through another animal's trick (like the *survenant* in Epicur. *ap.* Max. Tyr.). Both are also connected with their contexts at a somewhat higher level. Each allusion contains one ambiguous word (μῦθον, σοφωτάτου, καθηγούμενος, respectively). Two of them explicitly indicate the analogy between, and feature interaction of, the fable alluded to and its context (49A1, 49A3). In these two allusions, both put into Socrates' mouth, the narrator metaphorically represents both himself and the addressee (in one of these (49A1) in addition to a third party). In the other allusion (like in Plato's second fable) the protagonist is presented as a model. The selection of all fable characters in their particular contexts is apropos.

Phaedo's fable has only fragmentarily been preserved, and its context can only tentatively be reconstructed. Perhaps the fable was about Socrates' pederasty and contained one ambiguity (χαρίσασθαι).

Xenophon's fable has a double, persuasive function. The fable is a

postponed second-degree narrative in that Socrates advises Aristarchus to tell the fable to his female relatives to show that their complaint is unfair; the fable's addressee, then, is to become its narrator. As a matter of fact, the first addressee (Aristarchus) has to speak, the second (his female relatives) is to be silenced; both addressees are subtly prevailed upon to obey. Verbal parallels and explicit comparison indicate that both the addressee and a third party are metaphorically represented in the fable. This invites the identification of the narrator and the lurking enemy with the remaining fable characters. Again, the selection of most fable characters in this particular context is significant; their gender and grammatical number are relevant also. The fable can be connected with its context at a higher level, too; it is presented as a typical element of Socrates' dialectics.

Determining the exact function of three other allusions (to fables already discussed in previous Chapters) is hampered by the indirect and/or incomplete transmission of the text. According to Diogenes' (unparalleled) fourth-degree report, Menedemus applied an allusion from a satyr play by Achaeus (15A1) to his political opponents; perhaps the fable metaphorically represented both himself and them. At a higher level, the allusion expresses the eristic's great admiration for his townsman. Hieronymus (witness Athenaeus) preserves both a (pseudo-)Sophoclean allusion and its quasi-historical context (24A1). Chrysippus alludes to Ibycus' aetiological fable (8F1) as part of a logical argument.

Finally, it is noteworthy that all allusions but one (Pl. 49A3) are marked by an indication of the source, whether "Aesop" (Democritus, Pl. 49A1) or some author (Archilochus (Pl. 49A2), Antisthenes (Aristotle), Sophocles (Hieronymus), Ibycus (Chrysippus)).

SCIENCE

57. *Aristotle*[1]

57F1 Arist. *Mete.*[2] 2.3, 356b13-15: Charybdis and Water (*Aes.* 8)

Aristotle's *Meteorologica* contains the following fable:

"...Aesop has a fable about Charybdis[3] in which he says that she took one gulp of the sea and brought the mountains to view, a second one and the islands appeared, and that her last gulp will dry the sea up altogether."[4]

The fable[5] is recognizable as such by a (threefold) terminological indication (11 μύθων, 12-13 ἐμυθολόγησεν, 17 μῦθον) and a (threefold) connection with Aesop (11 Αἰσώπου, 12 ἐκεῖνος, 15 ἐκείνῳ); the tripartite structure of the story may be considered to be typical of the genre also[6]. Aristotle's version of the fable is paraphrased by two commentators on the passage, Alexander of Aphrodisias (57T2) and Olympiodorus (57T3), the latter more felicitously than the former[7]. A

---

[1] See also above, Arist. 34F/A1, 39F1-2, 52A1.

[2] Not "*Metaph.*" (Cascajero 1991, 57, perhaps misled by the abbreviation "*Met.*" used by some (e.g. Nøjgaard 1964, 126; Adrados 1979a, 417; Jedrkiewicz 1989, 408, n. 33).

[3] Not about Scylla (contra Waltz 1906b, 11, n. 1).

[4] Translation by Lee, H.D.P., *Aristotle. Meteorologica*, Loeb, 1952, 143, 145.

[5] Contra: Neubner 1889, 40; "mythe" (Nøjgaard 1964, 462 (but see ib. 126 (fable), 468 (aetiology))); Martínez Vázquez (1984, 35) wavers between "fábula" and "mito", Tricot (J., *Aristote. Les Météorologiques*, Paris: Vrin 1941, 100) between "fable[s]" and "légende".

[6] δὶς μὲν, τὸ μὲν πρῶτον, τὸ δὲ δεύτερον, τὸ δὲ τελευταῖον. Cf. Alex. Aphr. τὸ μὲν πρῶτον, τὸ δὲ δεύτερον, τὸ δὲ τρίτον; Olymp. δὶς, τρίτον; *fab. aes.* 8 Hausrath: ἐπὶ τρὶς, τὸ μὲν πρῶτον, ἐκ δευτέρου, τὸ τρίτον. Cf. e.g. Phaedr. G15b.13-15 *mus-alter-tertius*, *Aes.* 668 ("Three Wishes"), 687 ("Three True Statements"). In addition, Olympiodorus' version features three typical temporal adjuncts (πάλαι, εἶτα *bis*).

[7] Alexander's paraphrase of the primordial situation (πολλῆς οὔσης τῆς θαλάσσης καὶ πάσῃ τῇ γῇ περικεχυμένης) seems irreconcilable with the effect of Charybdis' first gulp, for, if all land was already there in the beginning (if surrounded by the sea), how can the mountains yet have to emerge? Therefore, Olympiodorus' *incipit* is preferable: πάλαι οὗτος ὁ τόπος θάλαττα ἦν.

variation of the fable has been included in the collections[8].

The fable is embedded in an anecdote about Aesop[9], who allegedly told the fable because he[10] was angry with (ὀργιζομένῳ) a ferryman (πορθμέα)[11]. Aesop's anger is revealed[12] by the venomous, if implicit, threat of his fable: Charybdis' final gulp will result in permanent unemployment for the ferryman, as Alexander of Aphrodisias explains[13]. Aristotle reports neither why Aesop is furious[14] nor how the ferryman reacted, but he apparently considers the fable to be an adequate retort (ἐκείνῳ...ἥρμοττεν...τοιοῦτον εἰπεῖν μῦθον). Alexander of Aphrodisias[15] reports that the fable frightened the ferryman, which is not at all unlikely, since Aesop's cosmology[16], which in fact amounts to an extrapolated aetiology, augurs ill for him.

Aristotle adduces Aesop's fable to dismiss Democritus' theory (68A100 Diels-Kranz[17]) that the sea will gradually dry up. He first states that Democritus' theory is much like Aesop's fable[18] (11-12 τῶν

---

[8] *Fab. aes.* 8 Hausrath. The differences (Zeus and chaos absent from Aristotle's, Charybdis from Aesopic version; second gulp reveals islands in Aristotle's, plains in Aesopic version [contra Dover 1966, 44]) are overlooked by Adrados 1979a, 533 and 1987a, 38; Schwarzbaum 1979, p. VII; Jedrkiewicz 1987, 59; rightly Martínez Vázquez 1984, 37; none, however, mentions the two commentators on Aristotle.

[9] Therefore, the *fable* should not be called "Esopo en el astillero" (Adrados 1979a, 395, 417), although *fab. aes.* 8 Hausrath is entitled Αἴσωπος ἐν ναυπηγίῳ. Cf. Perry 1959, 23, n. 26: "the story told by the fabulist about *Aesop* is not the same story as that which Aesop told to the shipbuilders."

[10] Olympiodorus complicates the matter by having Aesop have a soldier tell the fable to the ferryman.

[11] Not shipwrights as in *fab. aes.* 8 Hausrath (Denis 1883, 249; Hausrath 1909, col. 1718; Chambry 1960, p. XXIX; Perry 1962, 301; Jedrkiewicz 1987, 59 and 1989, 408).

[12] Aristotle's version of Aesop's fable is better not interpreted as a burlesque (contra Martínez Vázquez 1984, 37-38; cf. Adrados in the discussion after Falkowitz 1984, 30); cf. Dover 1966, 44.

[13] ὁ Αἴσωπος τὸν πορθμέα δεδιττόμενος ὡς οὐκ ἀεὶ τὸ ἔργον ἕξοντα, μυθολογεῖ ὡς... Cf. *fab. aes.* 8 Hausrath: ἐὰν δὲ δόξῃ αὐτῇ καὶ τὸ τρίτον ἐκπιεῖν τὸ ὕδωρ, ἄχρηστος ὑμῶν ἡ τέχνη γενήσεται.

[14] In *fab. aes.* 8 Hausrath Aesop has his reasons: he is mocked (for his deformity, Jedrkiewicz (1987, 59) wonders) and challenged by the shipbuilders (σκωπτόντων τε αὐτὸν καὶ ἐκκαλουμένων).

[15] ἐκείνῳ μὲν ἥρμοζεν ὀργιζομένῳ πρὸς τὸν πορθμέα διὰ τοῦ τοιούτου μύθου αὐτὸν φοβεῖν.

[16] Cf. Kovacs 1950, 15; Martínez Vázquez 1984, 37-38; Jedrkiewicz 1989, 59, 408.

[17] Cf. Kirk-Raven, 1960, 139; Solmsen, F., *Aristotle's System of the Physical World. A Comparison with his Predecessors*, Ithaca, New York: Cornell UP 1960, 421-422.

[18] Stewart (1958, 190, n. 26) suggests that "Democritus had originally used the example from Aesop himself"; cf. Spinelli 1991, 306, n. 74.

Αἰσώπου μύθων οὐδὲν διαφέρειν ἔοικεν ὁ πεπεισμένος οὕτως), and then dismisses the fable (and thereby Democritus' theory) as a fallacy[19] (17 τοῖς τὴν ἀλήθειαν[20] ζητοῦσιν ἧττον [*sc.* ἥρμοττε τοιοῦτον εἰπεῖν μῦθον]). Aristotle demonstrates its invalidity by the subsequent counterargument[21], whose conclusion diametrically opposes the concluding words of the fable: he substantiates that the sea will never dry up (25 ὥστε οὐδέποτε ξηρανεῖται; cf. 28 τί ἔσται τὸ ξηραῖνον;), whereas Aesop threatens the ferryman that it certainly will (15 ξηρὰν ποιήσει πάμπαν). Finally, Aristotle definitely puts the conflicting theory behind him by giving an alternative explanation for its empirical basis, the observable desiccation of many places (30-32) (which in the fable was foisted upon Charybdis), which, however, is only part of a cyclic process (32-36). This difference of opinion does not automatically imply that Aristotle does not take the fable seriously[22], as he does take some pains to refute it.

In addition to this interpretation of the fable, one might also draw a parallel between Aristotle's and Aesop's use of the fable: both narrate the fable to silence their opponents, the latter the ferryman, the former Democritus. Following this line of reasoning, Aristotle can be taken to imply by means of the fable that he is engaged in a fundamental polemic (ὀργιζομένῳ), on the one hand, and that he considers his retort to be adequate (ἥρμοττε) on the other.

57A1 Arist.[23] *HA* 9.32, 619a18-20: Man and Guest[24] (*Aes.* 422)
Aristotle's *History of Animals* contains an allusion (copied by Demetrius

[19] Cf. Olymp. καὶ περιττὸν ἡμῖν ἐστι τὸ ἐπιτήδευμα, οὐ χρὴ ταῦτα ἐννοεῖν.
[20] On the opposition ἀλήθεια-μῦθος in Aristotle, see Wilpert, P., "Zum aristotelischen Wahrheitsbegriff", *Philosophisches Jahrbuch der Görresgesellschaft*, Fulda 1940 (in: Hager, F.-P. [Hrsg.], *Logik und Erkenntnislehre des Aristoteles*, Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft 1972, 109, comparing (*inter alia*) *HA* 7(8).12, 597a7sq (on the pygmies).
[21] Cf. Alex. Aphr. ὅτι γὰρ ψεῦδος καὶ μυθῶδες τὸ λεγόμενον, ἑξῆς λέγει. According to Strohm, H., *Aristoteles, Meteorologie. Über die Welt*, Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft 1970, 175, however, Aristotle's argument is unconvincing.
[22] Contra Nøjgaard 1964, 502.
[23] Not Ps.-Arist. (contra Dittmeyer, L., "Die Unechtheit des IX. Buches der Aristotelischen Tiergeschichte", *Blätter für das Bayerische Gymnasialschulwesen* 23, 1887 *passim*; La Penna 1961, 525, n. 11; Perry 1965, 503; Dierauer 1977, 162, 164; Jedrkiewicz 1989, 226); see Balme-Gotthelf 1991, 1-13, 19-20.
[24] The fable should not be entitled "'El águila y el hombre'" (Adrados 1979a, 395), let alone "'El águila y el peregrino'" (Cascajero 1991, 30).

(57T1 = 43A1; G10)) to an aetiological fable[25] about a man who once wronged a guest of his and was in retaliation metamorphosed into an eagle. This species of bird starves to death, because its beak grows more and more curved in old age.

As in Demetrius, Aristotle's allusion to the fable is recognizable as such by both a terminological demarcation (μῦθος) and a typically indefinite introductory time adjunct (ποτε; see the Synthesis above). Although—witness Demetrius—the fable must have been familiar, fuller versions do not survive. Nonetheless, one might say that gradual starvation is an appropriate punishment for a host who failed to prepare his guest a hospitable welcome.

The connection between the allusion and its context at a somewhat higher level seems rather loose, since the next sentence describes the bird's habit of storing away *excess* food for the eaglets. However, the contrast between this apparent cornucopia and the eagle's eventual (and fatal) starvation is not that sharp, as Aristotle adds that this squirrelling is nothing but dire necessity in view of the many bad days to come.

57A2 Arist. *PA* 3.2, 663a35-663b3: Momus and Bull (*Aes.* 100)

Aristotle's *Parts of Animals* contains the following allusion to a fable[26], which is characterized by its ascription to Aesop:

"Momus in Aesop's fable is quite wrong when he finds fault with the bull for having his horns on the head, which is the weakest part of all, instead of on the shoulders, which, he says, would have enabled them to deliver the strongest possible blow."[27]

Aristotle here alludes to some variant of a widespread fable[28] in which Momus finds fault with the creations of three gods, viz. man,

[25] Thompson 1910: "folklore story"; Tricot, J., *Aristote. Histoire des animaux*, II, Paris: Vrin 1957, 635: "légende"; Balme-Gotthelf 1991, 299, 562: "myth"; likewise Preus (A., *Science and Philosophy in Aristotle's Biological Works*, Hildesheim/New York: Olms 1975, 24), suggesting that it "has something to do with one of Aristotle's earliest writings..., 'ὑπὲρ τῶν μυθολογουμέων ζῴων'" (*ap.* D.L. 5.1 (25)), for which see Moraux, P., *Les listes anciennes des ouvrages d'Aristote*, Louvain 1951, 8-9.

[26] Contra: Wienert 1925, 37, n. 1.

[27] Translation by Peck(-Forster) 1961, 221.

[28] Babr. 59; Luc. *Herm.* 20, *Nigr.* 32 (allusion), *VH* 2.3 (allusion); *fab. aes.* 102 Hausrath; *Pa.Bodl.* 125 Chambry; Erasm. (57T4, Pl. 49T15) (Adrados 1987a, 114-115; incomplete); cf. above, *Scol.* 6A1.

a bull, and a house. Strictly speaking[29], Aristotle alludes only to one-third of this fable, as he mentions only the bull, not man and the house. But this is not tantamount either to saying that the full form of the fable did not yet exist at the time or that Aristotle did not know it. This cannot be ascertained, but two parallels may be adduced. First, another episode of this fable pre-existed, witness an allusion in a *scolion* (6A1). Secondly, Lucian[30] twice alludes to the same episode of the fable as Aristotle but once relates the fable *in extenso*, which shows that an allusion to a part of the fable does not preclude knowledge of a fuller version with the author. However this may be, it is clear that Aristotle's allusion constitutes a minor variation compared with the other extant versions of the fable, as both the object and the tenor of Momus' criticism differ slightly. First, Aristotle has Momus criticize the creation itself (*in casu* the bull), not, as in the other versions, its creator (whether Poseidon or Zeus[31]). Secondly, according to Aristotle's Momus, the bull's horns should have been placed on the shoulders to be able to deliver a stronger blow, according to the other versions below or in front of the eyes (or the eyes on the horns[32]) to see better where to strike.

Aristotle alludes to the fable to demonstrate that Momus' critique is unjustified (οὐ γὰρ ὀξὺ βλέπων ὁ Μῶμος ταῦτ' ἐπετίμησεν), thus beating the faultfinder at his own game. Aristotle's rebuttal of Momus' argument is bipartite, making a positive and a negative point: he argues that the actual position of the horns has an important pro and at the same time limits an equally ponderous con to a minimum. On the one hand, the horns' place on the head ensures the greatest possible width of range (πόθεν πορρώτεραι); on the other hand, the horns would have been more of a hindrance if placed at any other part of the bull's body (ἀνεμπόδιστα πέφυκεν οὕτω μάλιστα).

Aristotle does not take the fable metaphorically, but literally (cf. Ar. 17F6). Aristotle's criticism of Momus seems superfluous since the

---

[29] Cf. Perry 1962, 324.

[30] Bull: *Nigr.*, *VH*; full: *Herm.*

[31] Zeus: *fab. aes.*; Poseidon: Babr., Luc. *Herm.*, *Pa.Bodl.*; creator not named: Luc. *Nigr.* τὸν δημιουργὸν θεόν; this is overlooked by Torraca, L., *Aristotele. Le parti degli animali*, Padova: CEDAM 1961, 256, n. 4.

[32] Horns below eyes: Babr., Luc. *VH*, *Pa.Bodl.*; horns in front of eyes: Luc. *Nigr.*; eyes on horns: *fab. aes.*; this is overlooked by Jedrkiewicz 1989, 407-408, n. 32; rightly: Ogle, W., *De Partibus Animalium* (with Farquharson, A.S.L., *De Motu* and *De Incessu Animalium*, Platt, A., *De Generatione Animalium*), Oxford: Clarendon P 1912; (only partly:) Bentley 1699, 228 (contra: Tyrwhitt); Torraca lc.

very fable alluded to obviously discredits Momus by showing that his carping is inspired (as usual) by dishonourable motives[33]. However, Aristotle apparently again (like 57F1) regards the fable as a rival physiological explanation, not to say theory, which has to be refuted because it detracts from his teleological natural philosophy: in each organism all parts "are intelligently organized" in order to "conspire for the greatest good of the whole"[34].

The fable is also obviously connected with its context in a somewhat higher sense, as the present section of *De partibus animalium* (3.2) is entirely devoted to horns (662b23 Περὶ...κεράτων).

58. *auctor incertus*

58F/A1 auct. inc. *ap.* Demetr. *Eloc.* 158: Moon and Cat (not in *Aes.*)

According to Demetrius (58T1 = 43A2; G10), someone invented a fable about the moon giving birth to a cat. This is an aetiological fable, explaining why cats wax and wane with the moon. Judging by Demetrius' testimony, the anonymous writer is likely to have narrated the aetiological fable somewhat more fully, as a brief paraphrase of a fable made up extempore raises rather than answers questions. The anonymous writer's idea, on the other hand, does not come out of the blue, as Egyptian mythology connects the cat with both the moon and the sun.[35] It is, however, unclear to which period and genre[36] the anonymous author belongs.

---

[33] *fab. aes.* φθονήσας τοῖς δημιουργήμασιν; Babr. 59.7 ὡς πέφυκε πάντας ἐχθραίνων.

[34] Peck(-Forster) 1961, 3; cf. Ross, D., *Aristotle*, London: Methuen; New York: Barnes & Noble 1949[5], 78-81, 123-128; Bartels, K., *Das Techne-Modell in der Biologie des Aristoteles*, Diss. Tubingen 1966. Cf. 'Ορθῶς...τὸ ἐπὶ τῆς κεφαλῆς ποιῆσαι τὴν τῶν κεράτων φύσιν; εἰ ἑτέρωθί που τοῦ σώματος κέρατα ἐπεφύκει, ...ἂν ἐμπόδια τῶν ἔργων πολλοῖς ἦν; πρὸς τὰς ἄλλας κινήσεις τοῦ σώματος ἀνεμπόδιστα πέφυκεν οὕτω μάλιστα.

[35] Grube (1961, 46, n. 56) usefully compares Plu. *Mor.* 376F. The animal is sacred both to Bast(et), the Moon goddess, who metamorphosed into a cat (Ov. *Met.* 5.330), and to the Sun god Ra (Horap. 1.10; cf. Sbordone, F., *Hori Apollinis Hieroglyphica*, Napoli: Contessa 1940, 24-25, comparing Gell. 20.8.6; Tim. Gaz., *CAG* 1.1, 98sq), with whose orbit the cat's eyes wax and wane; Keller 1909, 68-70.

[36] The fragment has been relegated to the present chapter as it is quoted by Demetrius after Arist. 57A1.

Conclusion

Setting aside the anonymous aetiology referred to by Demetrius, whose exact provenance remains a moot question, we may observe that all fables occurring in scientific prose are 'proto-scientific' themselves, in that they are aetiological or semi-aetiological: the three fables from Aristotle's scientific treatises explain or criticize the particular meteorological or zoological natural phenomenon under consideration.

Two of them, both ascribed to Aesop and borrowing its protagonist from mythology, are presented as rival, quasi-scientific theories, whose untenability Aristotle takes some pains to demonstrate; the other (from *History of Animals*), conversely, is not inconsistent with his observations. In addition, the one complete fable (57F1), being a second-degree story, seems to function as a rejoinder to an opponent on both levels.

GRAMMAR AND SCHOLIA[1]

59. *Aristarchus*

59A1 Aristarch. *in* Hes. *Op.* 210-211 (fr. 7 Waeschke) *ap.* Σ (Procl.?) ib. 207-212

Witness a scholiast (59T1; Proclus?) on Hesiod's fable (2F1), Aristarchus athetized the final two verses from the Hawk's speech to the Nightingale (210-211), "for it would be unbecoming for an irrational creature to speak in maxims". Aristarchus' athetesis[2] is sharply (but rightly[3]) criticized by Tzetzes (59T2), who, for reasons of principle, objects that animals cannot be prohibited from moralizing once they are granted the faculty of speech. More than that, the very argument put forward by Aristarchus is unconvincing[4], as it is quite common for animal (as well as human) fable characters to utter a gnomical *réplique finale.*[5] In addition, the verses in question are, it is true, problematic, but it has been shown above (Hes. 2F1) that they can be integrated in its context meaningfully indeed. Therefore, the disputed lines are to remain as they stand.[6]

---

[1] This chapter does not discuss *scholia vetera* which cannot be shown with certainty to date back to the Hellenistic Period.

[2] Followed by Neubner 1889, 8; Rzach, A., *Hesiodi carmina*, Leipzig 1902; Raddatz 1909, 32, n. *; Hausrath 1944, 20; Nøjgaard 1964, 497-498; García Gual 1977, 132, n. 25; id. 1978b, 184; Schnur 1978a, 36-39.

[3] Contra West's condescension (1978a, 208). This is, however, not to say that the solution put forward by Tzetzes himself is satisfactory; see above, Hes. 2F1, n. 67.

[4] Puelma (1972, 89, n. 18, noting (referring to Schoemann, G.F., *Dissertatio de veterum criticorum notis ad Hesiodi Opera et Dies,* Diss. Greifswald 1855, 17) that Aristarchus may have had additional grounds; West 1978a, 208.

[5] Animals: e.g. *Scol.* 6F1.4, *PRyl.* 493 *passim*, Phaedr. 1.26.12, 3.15.18, 4.20.6, Babr. 112.9-10, *fab. aes.* 146 Hausrath; humans: e.g. Ar. 17F3.1431, Babr. 6.16-17; Merkelbach 1972; Perry 1959, 30; West lc.

[6] Contra Merkelbach's metathesis (*SIFC* 27/28, 1956, 297; applauded by Puelma 1972, 89, n. 15) of αἴσχεα and ἄλγεα in 211 (see Clem. Al. (2T8), McKay 1962; West 1978a, 209) and Graevius' transposition (*in ed.*, Amsterdam 1667) of 210-211 after 212 (see West, ib. 105 (*in app. crit.*)).

60. *Crates Pergamenus*

60F/A1 Crates Perg. *ap.* Ael. *NA* 17.37[7]: Eagle, Serpent and Farmer (*Aes.* 395)

According to Aelian (60T1), Crates of Pergamum reported that Stesichorus (7F1) inserted the fable of the Farmer who saved an Eagle from a Serpent in one of his poems. The quondam context of the fable in Crates' (as in Stesichorus') work has been lost. However, its function is not an absolute *non liquet*, as Aelian's paraphrase does contain a clue: from the latter's explicit reference (τοῦτο δὴ τὸ 'Ομηρικόν) to Homer's omen of the eagle struck by a serpent which he held in his claws (*Iliad* 12.200sqq), one may reasonably infer that Crates adduced the fable (allegedly from Stesichorus) in his commentary[8] on this very passage. Starting from this assumption, one might suppose that Crates used the fable as a counterexample to the ominous ὄρνις: the fable proceeds from a situation comparable with the omen (an eagle in the coils of a snake), but the fable (as paraphrased by Aelian[9]) has justice done to both animals[10]: the Farmer kills the Snake, "an evil creature", and frees the Eagle, "the messenger and servant of Zeus"[11].

61. *Trypho*

61A1 Trypho (I), *Trop.* 2.24: Laurel, Olive and Bramble (*Aes.* 439)

Trypho *On Tropes*[12] quotes from Callimachus' plant fable (20F2.14):

[7] Book XVII (8-9) contains another reference to Crates: fr. 15 Mette (H.J., *Sphairopoiia. Untersuchungen zur Kosmologie des Krates von Pergamon*, Munchen: Beck 1936, 153-154).

[8] Διόρθωσις 'Ιλιάδος καὶ 'Οδυσσείας (*ap. Sudam*, κ 2342 Adler); "unsicher ob ident. mit Περὶ διορθώσεως [Sch. Od. 12,89 (p. 538 Dindorf)] und 'Ομηρικά [A-Sch. Il. 14,189 (o 189*a*[1], IV 50 Erbse)]" (Gartner, H., "Krates" (4), *DKP* 3, col. 328).

[9] εἰδὼς οὖν ὁ γεωργὸς τὸν μὲν εἶναι Διὸς ἄγγελον καὶ ὑπηρέτην, εἰδώς γε μὴν κακὸν θηρίον τὸν ὄφιν...

[10] These are typical *Kontrastfiguren*; cf. Ar. *Eq.* 197-198 (but see the Appendix below); Hainsworth, B. (Kirk 1993, III; *books 9-12*), 340: "the bird of Zeus and the symbol of chthonic power".

[11] Translation by Campbell 1982-1993, III 197.

[12] It is unclear to what extent this treatise derives from Trypho; see Velsen, A. de, *Tryphonis grammatici Alexandrini fragmenta*, Berlin 1853 (repr. Amsterdam: Hakkert 1965), 100-101; Gartner, H., "Tryphon", *DKP* 5, col. 991; West, M.L., "Tryphon *De Tropis*", *CQ n.s.* 15, 1965, 231.

"In Callimachus the Olive says ironically: 'I'm the ordinary one of all trees'". The quotation is ametrical, in that it is not a choliamb.[13]

To Trypho the reference to the fable serves as an exemplification of ἀστεϊσμός, of which he gives a definition—"speaking disparagingly about oneself"—and a synonym: προσποίησις, "pretension", "affectation" (LSJ sv). The fable is alluded to after two other examples of the same trope.[14] The three exemplifications are similar in that all are about someone who asserts his inferiority to his fellows. This similarity is apparent from a verbal parallel[15]. Trypho's third exemplification—the allusion under discussion—formally resembles the first one, in that both are in *oratio recta*[16], whereas the second one uses *oratio obliqua*. The third example—the quotation from Callimachus' fable—is not explained, but the other two are. The two preceding elaborations show that Trypho's own definition of ἀστεϊσμός is too broad; the trope apparently refers to speaking disparagingly about oneself *unduly*[17].

It might be remarked that Trypho's last exemplification seems the least felicitous. In Callimachus the olive may be alluding to a popular denomination of hers[18] in addition to disparaging herself. In principle, self-disparagement seems to be inconsistent[19] with the original Callimachean context of a *Streitgedicht*, in which two antagonists, *in casu* Olive and Laurel, typically[20] try to demonstrate their own superiority and their rival's inferiority, not *vice versa*—not even ironically.

---

[13] Pfeiffer (*in app. ad loc.*) conjectures: ἐγὼ δὲ πάντων εἰμὶ φαυλίη δενδρέων (with synizesis); cf. Barigazzi 1980, 243: "corrotto".

[14] ὡς εἴ τις πλουτῶν λέγει, ἐγὼ δέ εἰμι πάντων πενέστατος, καὶ ὁ πάντας καταπαλαίων λέγει ὑπὸ πάντων πίπτειν.

[15] πάντων *ter*, πάντας.

[16] {ἐγώ + εἰμί + πάντων} *bis*.

[17] Hence LSJ (sv) translate "ironical self-depreciation", "mock-modesty"; Schenkeveld, D.M., "Asteismus", in: Ueding 1, 1992, col. 1132: "Selbstverkleinerung".

[18] See above, Call. 20F2, n. 99; cf. φαύλισμα (LXX *Ze.* 3.11), φαυλισμός (ib. *Is.* 51.7) "disparagement" (LSJ).

[19] Cf. Wunsche 1908, 38 (who could not but draw the wrong conclusion, as *POxy.* 1011 and 2215 were yet to be found).

[20] See e.g. Gordon 1960, 144-147; Wagner, E., "Die arabische Rangstreitdichtung und ihre Einordnung in die allgemeine Literaturgeschichte", *Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur in Mainz, Abh. der geistes- und sozialwissenschaftlichen Kl.* 1962, 8; Gragg 1973, 51; Brunner 1980, 197; Alster, B.-Vanstiphout, H., "Lahar and Ashnan. Presentation and Analysis of a Sumerian Disputation", *Acta Sumerologica* 9, 1987, 9, 11; id., "The Importance of "The Tale of the Fox"", ib. 10, 1988, 206-207; id. 1990; Krispijn 1993, 137-148.

Nevertheless, in Callimachus the olive appears to deviate from this principle more than once.

Conclusion

Although prudence is called for in view of the indirect and incomplete tradition of the passages from Aristarchus and Crates, we may say that the fables told or alluded to by scholiasts or grammarians do *not*, unlike most of those discussed in the preceding Chapters, seem to have a specific metaphorical relation to their contexts.

Both Aristarchus and Trypho allude to one fable each (by referring to words spoken by the protagonist to his antagonist) only for some textual or technical reason, respectively, whereas Crates (like most epigrammatists discussed above (in Chapter II.VII)) may have adduced one as a general illustration of justice done. Aristarchus passes textual criticism on the fable in question; Crates, conversely, appears to have brought one up with approval.

All fables are taken by prosaists from older poets, whose fables have been studied in previous Chapters.

FINAL CONCLUSION[1]

Quæ utilitas Fabulæ?—Multiplex (Pomey 1665, 12)

Before drawing general conclusions from the above analyses of the functions of (allusions to) fables in Archaic, Classical, and Hellenistic Greek literature, two major *caveats* have to be made, one in view of the fragmentary and/or indirect preservation of the (con)text of some (allusions to) fables, another in view of the problematic definition of the genre. It is far from certain that particular passages in some authors (Stratt. 19A1, Theoc. 21A1; cf. Ar. *Av.* 439-442, as well as Pl. *Phdr.* 272c and *R.* 6.2, 487a in the Appendix below) are really to be understood as allusions to fables, as some testimonies state they are, whereas in other authors (1. Homer, 32. Thucydides, 44. Alcmaeon) no fables occur despite allegations to the contrary in antiquity.

One may distinguish the ways in which (allusions to) fables are (1) demarcated from, and (2) interconnected with, their respective contexts.

1. *The Demarcation of Fables from their Contexts*

First, some formal observations.

As has been remarked in the Synthesis above, fables (or allusions to fables) may not only be recognizable as such by some terminological indication or some connection with the name of Aesop but are also (or instead) often characterized by typical elements, viz. *pronomina* and/or *adverbia indefinita*, often occurring in the *incipit*:

- *pronomina*
  - [τις] Stesich. 7T4 (Ael.); Ibyc. 8T2 (Ael.); Timocr. 10T5 (Zen.); S. 13F2 (cf. 13F1 (in the epimythium)); Ar. 17F2, 17F4, 17A6, 17T22 (Σ); Antip. Sid. 27F2; Carpyllides 28F1, 28T1 (*lemm.*); Arist. 39F1; D. 40T5-6 (Σ *in* Luc./Pl.), 40T8 (Phot.); Demad. 41F1; Antipho 45F1 (plus once (like Archil. 4F1a-h, 4F2a-c) with a terminological indication); Pl. 49T11 (Σ; cf. 49F2) (*bis*); Phaedo 51F1a; Arist. 57T3 (Olymp.) (*bis*)

[1] See also the conclusions at the end of the previous chapters.

- [*quidam*] Arist. 39T2a (Arist. Lat. (*anon.*)); D. 40T13 (Erasm.)
- *quispiam* D. lc
- cf. ἀνήρ A. 12F2, S. 13F1-2, Ar. 17F3, Antipho 45F1 *bis*; cf. Hdt. 31F1 ἄνδρα...αὐλητήν

- *adverbia*
  - temporal:
  - ποτε (Nic. 3T1a (Σ); S. 13F1; Ar. 17F1, 17F4-5 (plus once in the context), 17A2-3, 17T22 (Σ), 17T50ab (Tricl.; once in the context); Pl. 49F2; Arist. 57A1 (Demetr. 43A1); Call. 20F2 (κοτε); Socr. 25F1 (in the promythium); Leon. 26F1; Antip. Sid. 27F2; Arch. Mytil. 29F1; D. 40T4 (Zen.), 40T5-6 (Σ in Luc./Pl.) (in the context (twice)), 40T8 (Phot.) (in the context), 40T10b-12 (*Suda*, Apostol., Arsen.)); Demad. 41T1 (*fab. aes.*) (in the context); Pl. 49T12a (Olymp.)
  - *aliquando*: D. 40T7 (Isid.)
  - *quondam*: D. 40T13 (Melanchthon)
  - *olim*: Demad. 41T2 (Dati) (in the context)
  - cf. πάλαι: Ar. 17A2, Call. 20F2 (in the context), Arist. 57T3 (Olymp.); anomalous negation οὐ πάλαι (D. 40T5-6 (Σ in Luc./Pl.))
  - cf. οὕτω(ς) (see Σ *in* Ar. G67a): A. 12F2, Ar. 17F1
  - cf. Ἦν κεῖνος οὑνιαυτός, ᾧ τό τε πτηνόν | καὶ τοὺν θαλάσσῃ καὶ τὸ τετράπουν αὔτως | ἐφθέγγεθ' ὡς ὁ πηλὸς ὁ Προμήθειος Call. 20F1.1-3; ὅτε φωνήεντα ἦν τὰ ζῷα: X. 50F1 (cf. Liv. G11; Max. Tyr. G33; φασὶ X. lc, Simon. 9T3 (*Cod. Par.*), Phaedo 51F1ab; Ibyc. 8T2 (Ael.) ἡ φήμη φησί)
  - local:
  - ὅποι (Antipho 45F1)
  - cf. ποθὲν (Ar. 17F2); εἴς τινα τόπον Nic. 3T1a (Σ), ἔν τινι χώρῳ Timocr. 10T5 (Zen.), κατά τινα ποταμόν Demad. 41F1
  - Some fables, however, contain anomalously specific local adjuncts (Semon. 5F1, Timocr. 10F1, Ar. 17F3-4, Call. 20F2 ((probably) subtly referring to Aesop); Antip. Sid. 27F2[2]; D. 40T3-6, 40T8-12 (Ps.-Plu. Zen. Σ in Pl./Luc. Phot. *Suda* Apostol. (Arsen.)))[3]

---

[2] 20 Ὀλυμπιάδος, but cf. Gow-Page *ad loc.* (1965, II, 85): "perhaps meaning merely *divine*".

[3] This occasionally occurs also in the fable collections: Phaedr. 1.2 *Athenae, Attici*; 1.25.3 *Nilo*; 2.5.1 *Romae, Neapolim, Misenensem, Siculum, Tuscum, Pelusio*; 2.9 *Attici, Latium, Graeciae*; 3.1.2 *Falerna*; 3.10.35 *Romam*; 3.14.1 *Atticus*; 4.5.13 *Athenas*; 4.7 *Pelii*,

- *modal:* πως (Ar. 17F3)

Not only the introduction, but also the final stage of a fable may be formally marked by some temporal adjunct:

- εἶθ'(Ar. 17F4)/εἶτα (Arist. 57T3 (Olymp.) (*bis*))/κᾆτ' (S. 13F2)
- κἄπειτ('/α) (Ar. 17F2-3, 17F6)
- τότε (Timocr. 10T5 (Zen.), Antip. Sid. 27F2)
- *tunc* (D. 40T7 (Isid.))
- cf. Antipho Soph. 45F1 ὑστέρῳ δὲ χρόνῳ (τότε referring back to the initial situation).

All of these typical elements can be found also in the fable collections.[4] The same goes for the device of *kenning* (especially in Hellenis-

Thessala, Ponti, Graium, Aegea...freta; 4.23 *Asiae, Cia, Clazomenae*; 5.1.2 *Athenas*; 5.7.27 *Roma*; 5.10.7 *Lacon*; *App.* 8 *Delphos, Parnasum, Delu*; 10.31 *Romani*; 13.2 *Phryx*; 30.2 *Graeci*. Babr. 5.1 Ταναγραίων (*et ap. Sudam*, τ 69 Adler), 8.1 Ἄραψ, 12.8 Θρᾴκην; 12.22 Ἀθήνας; 18.4: Θρᾴκης; 57 Ἀράβων, Ἄραβες; 72.16 Ἀθηναίῃ; 85 Ἀχαιός, Κρήτης, Μολοσσῶν, Ἀκαρνάνων, Δόλοπες, Κύπρον, Θρᾴκην; 108.24 (*et ap. Sudam*, κ 280 Adler) Καμειραίης (*Suda*-αίας); 115.7 τῆς Ἐρυθρῆς; 120.6 Ὄλυμπον; 131.5 κάτω Θήβας. *fab. aes.* (ed. Hausrath) 5 Ἀθήνησιν; 28 Ἀττικάς I, III; 30 Ἀθηναῖος, Ἀθηνᾶ; 32 Νεῖλον I; 33 Ῥόδῳ, Ῥόδος I; 36 Δελφοῖς; 75 Μελιταίους I/Μελιταῖα III, Σούνιον, Ἀθηναίων I/Ἀττικῆς III, Ἀθηναῖος, Πειραιᾶ, Ἀθηναίων; 93 (I) Μελιταῖος; 114 (Ib) Ὀλύμπου; 231 Μαίανδρον, Μίλητον; 274: Αἰθίοπα; 293 Λιβάνου. Avian. 2 *Rubris...harenis*; 5 *Gaetuli*; 10.3 *Campum*; 13.4 *Cinyphii*; 15.1 *Threiciam*; 32.5 *Tirynthius*. Aphth. 6 Αἰθίοπα. Rom. (ed. Thiele) 27 (*gall. vet.*) *Athenienses* (-*is* W.), 57 (*gall.*) **molos<os>* (pro *malos* leg.); 98 (*gall. vet.*) *Atticorum*. Synt. 41 Αἰθίοπα, Ἰνδόν. *Pa. Bodl.* (ed. Chambry) 113 Ἀράβων; 163 Ἀθηναία; 235 Ὑμηττία. *Tetr.* 1.22.2 Λίβυσσα. Nøjgaard (1964, 231-245; see above, Chapter I.I, I.3), however, considers all fables containing local indications to be non-fables.

[4] Time adjuncts: (introduction) *quondam*: Phaedr. 1.6.3, 1.24.2, 1.28.3; Avian. 2.1, 7.3, 14.1, 18.1, 31.1, 39.1; *forte* (cf. Mayer, R., Cambridge: UP 1994, on Hor. *Ep.* 7.29): Avian. 5.5, 7.3, 13.1, 42.1; ποτε: Babr. 3.1, 21.1, 29.1, 32.1, 72.1, 85.1, 89.1, 93.1, 94.1, 97.1, 105.1, 106.1, 115.1, 121.1; *fab. aes.* 7 III, 8 (context), 25, 33 I, 35 I, 40 (δήποτε), 60, 84 III, 87, 231, 239 Hausrath; *Tetr.* 2.14, 30b; Niceph. Basil. *Prog.* 1.1, 1.3, 1.4, 1.5, 1.6, 1.7; *Pa.Bodl.* 14, 37, 76 Chambry; Synt. 51, 53, 55; *Dod.* 6.1, 14.1, 15.1, 20.1, 59.1, 66.1, 69.1, 147.1, 228.1, 231.1, 269.1, 282.1, 333.1, 336.1, 339.1 Chambry; πάλαι: *cod. Branc.* (*Aes.*, p. 507); *Tetr.* 2.9, 16, 17, 23, 24; *Dod.* 40.1 (Chambry: πάλιν cod.); (final stage) *tunc*: Phaedr. 1.11.12; Avian. 4.15, 18.15, 22.3, 30.9. ἔπειτα: Babr. 18.11. εἶτα: Babr. 1.8; *fab. aes.* 33 III Hausrath; Synt. 20, 28, 37, 51, 55; *Tetr.* 1.29.4; *Dod.* 231.6 Chambry. τότε: Babr. 89.10; *fab. aes.* 53 II Hausrath; *Dod.* 73.10, 81.5 Chambry. Place adjuncts: *fab. aes.* 1 (I) Hausrath: ἐπί τι περίμηκες δένδρον; 2: ἀπό τινος ὑψηλῆς πέτρας (I, II); 4: ἐπί τινος ὑψηλῆς δρυός I, II, *et cetera passim*; Synt. 7: τόπῳ τινί, ἐφ' ὑψηλοῦ τινος; 8: ἔν τινι τοίχῳ; 61: ἔν τινι ποταμῷ; *Tetr.* 2.1.1: εἴς τί που σπέος. For the references from the *Tetrastichs*, see Van Dijk 1996b, 168, n. 28.

tic Poetry: Nic. 3F1, Call. 20F1, Leon. 26F1, Antip. Sid. 27F2; furthermore in Timocr. 10A1, Antisth. 48F1 (Arist. 52A1)).[5]

Not only the fable proper, but also its epimythium (if any) may be introduced in a formally typical way, either

- expressing the analogy between the fable and some (first, second, third) person (singular, plural) in the context
  - οὕτω δὲ καὶ
    - ὑμεῖς: Stesich. 7T1 (Arist. 39F1)
    - σὲ καὶ τὸ σὸν...: S. 13F1
    - σὺ: Ar. 17F3
  - ὥσπερ οὖν καὶ αὐτῷ μοι: Pl. 49F1
  - ἀτὰρ καὶ ὑμᾶς: Arist. 39F2
  - καὶ σὺ: X. 50F1; cf. D. 40T7 (Isid.) *Philippum quoque*
  - καὶ τοῦτο: Pl. 49A3, cf. 49A1 καὶ τοῦ...νομίσματος
  - οὕτως οὖν καὶ παρὰ *c. dat.* Pl. 49T12a (Olymp.)
- or (in the Hellenistic Epigrams) evaluating the fable
  - ἴδ' ὡς: Antip. Sid. 27F1-2, Arch. Mytil. 29F1; cf. Ὅρα νυν, ὡς introducing Ar. 17A3
  - cf. ἦ (ἄ)ρα in Carpyllides 28F1 and Arch. Antioch. 30F1

With this formal introduction of the epimythium one may compare the occurrence of a causal or temporal adjunct introducing the aetiology proper in aetiological fables:

- ἐξότε: Nic. 3F1
- ἐκεῖθεν: Call. 20F1
- διὰ ταῦτα: Pl. 49F1
- ἐξ ὧν: Pl. 49F2
- cf. the use of ἄρα and νυνί in Euelpides' mock aetiology after Ar. 17F6

[5] Phaedr. 1.1.6 *laniger* (= Sheep; but see Oberg 1996a, 247); 1.2.28 *Tonans* (= Iupiter); 1.6.6 *quaedam...stagni incola* (= *rana*); 1.11.6 *auritulus* (= *asinus*); 1.17.8 *bidens* (=*ovis*); 4.4.3 *sonipes* (= Horse); 4.9.10 *barbatus (= hircus)*; *App.* 8.7 *Delii...dei* (= *Apollinis*). Babr. 122.12 (*et ap. Sudam sv* κνηκίας) τὸν κνηκίην (*Suda*-ίαν) (= λύκον). Avian. 4.15 *Titan* (= *Phoebus*); 13.3-4 *hirsutus...Cinyphii ductor qui gregis esse solet*, cf. 9 *te demissis saetosum, putide, barbis*; 18.1 *Threiciam uolucrem* (= *grus*), *Iunonius ales* (= *pavo*); 32.5 *rector Tirynthius* (= Heracles); 34.15 *Paruula* (= *formica*); 38.3: *squamigerum...agmen* (fish); 42.4 *inter lanigeros...greges* (sheep). Rom. 55 Thiele *auritus* (= hare). *Dod.* 356 Chambry.9 ἡ μυοκτόνος μήτηρ (cat). *Tetr.* 1.44.1 πτῶκες (hares), *passim* κερδώ (fox), 2.15.4 πωγωνίαν (= τράγον).

- ἀφ' οὗ χρόνου: Nic. 3T1ab (Σ)
- ὅθεν: Nic. 3T1a (Σ)
- διὸ: Nic. 3T1b (Σ)
- διὰ τοῦτο ἐξ ἐκείνου: Nic. 3T2 (Eutecn.)
- ἐντεῦθεν: Nic. 3T2 (Eutecn.)
- ἔκτοτε: Call. 20T1 (*Dieg.*))
- cf. δι' ἣν...αἰτίαν after Arist. 57F1.

In addition, some fables are demarcated from their context by the device of ring composition (Hes. 2F1, A. 12F2, Hdt. 31F1; cf. S. 13F2).[6]

The large[7] number of *allusions* to fables testifies to the genre's popularity. This popularity is allegedly exploited by two Classical orators (Demosthenes, Demades: 40F2, 41F1) to regain the attention of the audience, which is in accordance with the general advice of three Latin rhetorical handbooks.

Allusions to fables may be recognizable by—again in addition to, or instead of, (1) some terminological indication and/or (2) some connection with Aesop's name, for which see above, Chapter I.III—some combination of (3) the name of the author of the fable alluded to, (4) a quotation from the fable alluded to, (5) the fable's principal character(s) (often preceded by the definite article), (6) some indication of the fable's action:

- 1 + 2 + 4 + 5 + 6: Demetr. 43A1;
- 1 + 2 + 5 + 6: Ar. 17A2-3;
- 1 + 2 + 5: Pl. 49A1;
- 1 + 5 + 6: Demetr. 43A2;
- 2 + 5 + 6: Arist. 57A2;
- 2 + 5: Democr. 47A1;
- 3 + 4 + 5: Trypho 61A1;
- 3 + 5 + 6: Ar. 17A6, Arist. 52A1;
- 3 + 4: Ar. 17A4, Chrysipp. 56A1, Aristarch. 59A1;
- 3 + 5: Pl. 49A2;
- 4 + 5: Ar. 17A1 (parodied), Cerc. 22A1, Demetr. 43A2, Pl. 49A3 (*oratio obliqua*);

[6] Later examples include J. *AJ* 5.236-238 (7.2) (*Aes.* 262) and Procop. 1.3.13 (not in *Aes.*). See Van Dijk 1993b, 32; 1994b, 129, n. 105; 1994e.

[7] Jacobs (1889, 30), however, exaggerates when he states that allusions *outnumber* fables.

- 5 + 6: *Scol.* 6A1, Timocr. 10A1, Achae. 15A1 ?, Ar. 17A5, S. 24A1, Phld. 42A1b, Arist. 57A1;
- 5: Phld. 42A1a.

Some fables occur more than once in Archaic, Classical, and Hellenistic literature. Most of these are used once by two different authors, but (probably) two by three (Archil., Ar., Pl.; Stesich. *ap.* Arist., Philist. ?) and one even by seven (Nic. Ibyc. Aristias S. Dinol. Apolloph. Chrysipp.). One author (Phld.) uses the same fable twice (consecutively), another (Ar.) even thrice (in different works (*V. Pax Lys.*)). Within each "doublet" one (allusion to a) fable may or may not explicitly refer to the other. The former case fully justifies a comparison, whereas in the latter a common or intermediary source has to be allowed for:

- one explicitly refers to another:
  - the fable referred (alluded) to has (at least fragmentarily) been preserved elsewhere: Aristarch. 59A1 ~ Hes. 2F1; Trypho 61A1 ~ Call. 20F2; Demetr. 43A1 ~ Arist. 57A1; Aristophanes twice alludes to fables by both Archilochus (17A3 ~ 4F1; 17A1 (and Pl. 49A2) ~ 4F2) and Aeschylus (17A4 ~ 12F1; 17A6 ~ 12F2);
  - the fable explicitly referred to has not been preserved elsewhere (cf. the connection of fables with the name of Aesop (see above, Chapter I.III, 4.1)): Ibyc. *ap.* Chrysipp.; auct. inc. *ap.* Demetr.; anon. *ap.* Phld.; Aristotle refers to two such fables, retelling Stesich. 7F2 and alluding to Antisth. 48F1; another lost fable by Stesichorus is referred to by Crates (witness Aelian)

- it cannot be ascertained whether or not one explicitly referred to another: Timocr. 10F2 ~ Simon. 9F1; Ibyc. 8F1 ~ Aristias 11F1 ~ S. 14F1 ~ Dinol. 16F1 ~ Apolloph. 18F1; Philist. 33F1 (if really the same fable) ~ Stesich. 7F2 (*ap.* Arist.); Menedemus Eretr. 53T1 (D.L.) ~ Achae. 15A1

- one does not explicitly refer to another: Ibyc. 8F1-Aristias 11F1-S. 14F1-Dinol. 16F1-Apolloph. 18F1-Chrysipp. 56A1 ~ Nic. 3F1; Ar. 17F5, 17A2, 17A5 ~ Semon. 5F; Ar. 17A3 ~ Archil. 4F1a-h; Theoc. according to Galen (21T1) ~ Ar. 17F6; D.S. 38F1 ~ Hieronym. Hist. 37T1 (if really Diodorus' source); Arist. 57A2 ~ *scol.* 6A1 (another stage of the same fable).

Different fables may, of course, also be compared in terms of the constellation of, or the part played by, the principal characters. Two different fables (Aristobul. 36F1, D. 40F1; X. 50F1) are about sheep protected by dogs, whereas another two confront a lion cub with a man (A. 12F2, Ar. 17A6; Phaedo 51F1ab); in two other fables (Demad. 41F1, Pl. 49A3) a river is presented as an obstacle, which all characters but one hesitate to overcome. The eagle has the worst of it in three different fables (Archil. 4F1a-h; Semon. 5F2, Ar. 17F5, 17A2, 17A5; Achae. 15A1; cf. Arist. 57A1, Demetr. 43A1), whereas the fox typically[8] outfoxes his antagonists in another three (Archil. 4F1a-h (if only with Zeus' help); id. 4F2, Pl. 49A2; id. 49A1; cf. Epicur. 54T1 (Max. Tyr.); not[9] in Timocr. 10A1 (at least not in the Aesopic version)).

As for the metre of the (allusions to) fables occurring in poetry, iambs (cf. Babr. G19ab) are most frequent[10] (trimeters: Semon. 5F1-2; A. 12F1; S. 13F1-2; Achae. 15A1; Ar. 17F1-5, 17A1-4, 17A6; dimeters: Timocr. 10A1; trimeter + dimeter: Archil. 4F1a-h; trimeter + dactylic hemiepes: Archil. 4F2a-c; choliambic trimeter: Call. 20F1-2; iambs + trochees: Cerc. 22A1), but dactylic (hexameters: Epic, Theoc. 21A1 (according to Galen); elegiac distichs: Epigram), anapaestic (tetrameters: Ar. 17F6), trochaic (tetrameters: Ar. 17F6), and more complex metres (*Scol.* 6F1 (telesillea plus glyconics), 6A1; A. 12F2) occur also.

As regards the relation of fable with other genres (see above, Part I), (allusions to) fables may be based upon (D. 40F2), become (A. 12F1; Ar. 17A5-6), or contain (Ar. 17F3), proverbs. The problematic implications of this reciprocity of fable and proverb are exemplified

---

[8] This is apparent from the animal's very epithets: κερδαλέος (Archil. 4F2a, Pl. 49A2, Archil. 4T18-19 (Basil.); cf. κερδώ (e.g. Babr. 81.3, *Tetr.* 2.7.3), κερδῷος (Babr. 77.2)), ποικίλος (Pl. lc, Basil. llcc), πανοῦργος (Archil. 4T13a (Attic.), Sopat. Rh. G58 *ap.* Jo. Sard. (Doxap. κακοῦργος)), δριμύς (Attic. lc), κομψός (Philostr. G42), σοφός (Epicur. 54T1 (Max. Tyr.), Babr. 103.11; cf. Pl. lc), δολερός (Them. G57), δεινός (Pl. 49T7 (Σ)), *dolosus* (Phaedr. 1.13.11; cf. *improbus* (id. *App.* 32.3)), *astutus* (Avian. 6.9), *argutus* (ib. 40.7); Van Dijk 1995a, 251, n. 46.

[9] Cf. above, Them. G57, n. 139.

[10] Cf. Adrados 1979a, 255-259, with two short comments: several passages mentioned there are relegated here to the Appendix below; for "Stesichorean" iambs, see above, Stesich. 7F2, nn. 126 and 158, as well as, on the reconstruction of iambs from prose in general, Arist. *Po.* 4, 1449a25-28 and *Rh.* 3.8, 1408b33-35; Huschke 1810, p. CCXLVI: "Nihil facilius est, quam e verbis scriptoris qualiscunque Iambos eruere... Quo magis cavendum est, ne, quod Ixioni accidit, nubem pro Iunone amplectamur."

by Stratt. 19A1. The claims of autopsy in two Sophoclean fables (13F1-2) are riddle-like; cf. the *kenningar* referred to above.

2. *The Interconnection of Fables and their Contexts*

2.1 *Analogy*

The analogy between the fable and its context can be explained by (a combination of) various means, viz.:

- explicitly indicated
  - ἀτεχνῶς κατὰ...: Pl. 49A1
  - ἅπερ: Arist. 52A1
  - οὐδὲν διαφέρειν *c. gen.*: Arist. 57F1
  - καθάπερ: Epicur. 54T1 (Max. Tyr.); negated (see below): Arist. 57A2
  - εἴκασεν *c. dat.*: Aristobul. 36F1; cf. Ar. 17A4 ᾐκάσμεσθα; Pl. 49T12a, 49T12c (Olymp.) ἀπεικάζει, ἀπείκασεν
  - ἐμφερὴς *c. dat.*: S. 13F2
  - ὅμοιος: S. 13F2; cf. Arist. G5 τὸ ὅμοιον; negated (see below): Theon, G20c
  - οὐδείς ποτ' ἄλλος ἤ: S. 13F2
  - οὐκ ἀνοίκειον *c. gen.*: D.S. 38F1
  - τὸ παραπλήσιον: D.S. 38F1-2, Theon G20c
  - τρόπον *c. gen.*: Phld. 42A1b
  - ἰκέλη *c. dat.*: Democr. 47A1
  - ἀντὶ *c. gen.*: X. 50F1
  - τὸ αὐτὸ *c. dat.*: Stesich. 7T1 (Arist. 39F1)
  - εἰκόνα: Stesich. 7T3 (Conon)
  - [πρόσφορος] Pl. 49T12ab (Olymp.)
- suggested by linguistic means
  - assonance and (Demad. 41F1: Δήμητρα ~ Δημάδης)/
  - or alliteration (Arist. 39F1: πλήρεις-πλούσιος, πεινῶντες-πένητες; cf. the substitution of πώγων' for πυγὴν in Ar. 17A1)[11]

[11] One might compare the instances of "alliterative linking" "enforcing the...relation between tenor and vehicle" collected by Silk 1974,175-184.

- expressed in a
  - promythium (Timocr. 10T3 (Ps.-Diogenian.); Socr. 25T1 (D.L.); cf. Nic. 3F1)
  - epimythium (note the use of οὕτω(ς)/ὥσπερ and/or καὶ or *quoque*; see above, 1)
  - *réplique finale*, bearing on the context rather than on the fable (Ar. 17F2; cf. 17F3)
- (frequently) by (more or less) verbal parallels, in some cases (Stesich. 7F2, D.S. 38F1) enabling the logical solution of other unknowns in the metaphorical equation by some intellectual activity on the part of the audience.

The analogy between (an allusion to) a fable and its context, indicated by the above means, can yet be extended or emphasized by having the two (inter)textual levels intersect in one way or another. This may be done:

- by intrusion
  - of the context into the (allusion to the) fable: S. 13F1: ναύτας, ναυτίλων; Ar. 17F4 [ἐχῖνος] (*bis*; cf. Arist. 39F2)); D. 40T5-6 (Σ *in* Luc./Pl. δικαστήριον); Arist. 52A1 ?: ἴσως; cf. the acrostic of the author's name in Nic. 3F1
  - of the (allusion to the) fable into its context: S. 13F1 νέφους, ἐκπνεύσας, χειμών, κατασβέσειε; Ar. 17A5: μαιεύσομαι; Arist. 39F1 (Stesich. 7T1): χαλινόν, ἀναβῆναι; D. 40F1 (Aristob. 36F1): μονόλυκον; Antipho Soph. 45F1: πένητα; Pl. 49A1: ἴχνη, 49A3: ἰόντες, ἐμπόδιον, μένουσι, ἴωμεν; 49T12b (Olymp.): γηρῶσα; Epicur. 54T1 (Max. Tyr.): ἐκτεινόμενον, διώκεται; cf. the metaphorical use of the fable's principal character(s) in Timocr. 10A1 (fox), Ar. 17A1 (ape) and 17A5 (αἰετὸν τίκτοντα κάνθαρός)
- by using ambiguous words
  - words in the (allusion to the) fable, which are ambiguous in view of its context[12]: Nic. 3F1: γέρας (the fable itself (like Ibyc. 8F1, Aristias 11F1, S. 14F1, Dinol. 16F1, Apolloph. 18F1) be-

[12] The ambiguous words which occur in some other fables (S. 13F2: λόγον; Call. 20F2: φαύλη; D.S. 38F1: θηριωδῶς; Antipho Soph. 45F1: ἀναιρούμενον, ἀπέθετο, [κατατίθεμαι] *bis*, [χράω] *quater*; cf. Archil. 4F2a, Hdt. 31F1) are "internal", i.e. they do not refer to the respective context.

ing based upon[13] the ambiguity of γῆρας); *scol.* 6F1: εὐθύς, σκολιός; S. 24A1: χλιαίνων; Pl. 49A3: καθηγούμενος; Phaedo 51F1a ?: χαρίσασθαι; cf. Arist. 39F2: πεινῶντες, ἐκπιοῦνται; Stesich. 7T3 (Conon): ἐτάραττε; Timocr. 10T3 (Ps.-Diogenian.): διαφυγοῦσαι, ἐμπεσοῦσαι; Archil. 4F1d.2-3: ἀνθρώπων...λεωργά

- words in the context, which are ambiguous in view of the (allusion to the) fable[14]: Ar. 17F3: λέγε; Phld. 42A1a: Δία, ἐ[ρισ]τικά; Pl. 49A1: μῦθος, 49A2: σοφωτάτου; cf. Hes. 2T12 (Eun.): ['Ιέραξ] *bis.*

- by (so to speak) "breaking through the metaphorical illusion" (in Aristophanes and (allegedly in) Sophocles)
  - taking the fable's metaphor literally (S. 24A1 (Sun, North Wind, stripping); cf. Ar. 17F6 (head), Arist. 57A2 (horns)), and
  - simultaneously visualizing it ("realizing the metaphor") (Ar. 17A2 (dung beetle), 17A3-4 (feathers), threatened in 17A5 (breaking eggs)); cf. the (hypothetical) staging of S. 14F1 (a (non-metaphorical) aetiology).

The selection of a particular fable (as narrative or allusion) is often very apt, as the very nature (bird fables, all but one told to birds, in *Birds*), physical appearance (Cercidas' home-bearing tortoise (possibly)), number (Herodotus' single flute-player catching a school of fish), gender, produce (male vs. wool-producing females in Xenophon), and/or (positive or negative) connotations of the fable characters are appropriate in the particular context. This goes for Aristotle's (and probably Antisthenes') hares and lions, and Plato's men fording a river. Conveying positive connotations is tactful, negative ones insinuating. Such connotations can be exploited

- positively: to
  - keep up morale (Diodorus' frightening lion)
  - mitigate criticism (Diodorus' eligible man, the Aristotelian Aesop's prescient fox)

[13] Wienert (1925, 40), excluding (*inter alia*) "Wortspiele" from the fable collections, does apparently not allow for such a possibility, although, e.g., *fab. aes.* 134 Hausrath (*Aes.* 254) puns on καρδία.

[14] The ambiguous words which occur in the context of S. 24A1 (ὡμίλησε, σπείρων, ἀπάγεις) are "internal", i.e. they do not refer to the allusion.

- justify oneself (Demosthenes (?)' and Xenophon's sheep-dogs; Plato's and Epicurus' (Maximus Tyrius') keen foxes (representing philosophers));
- negatively: to
  - intimidate (Herodotus' netted fish),
  - criticize
    - oneself (Timocreon's dock-tailed fox) or
    - somebody else (Aristotle's parasites; Demosthenes' and Xenophon's wolves (representing the enemy); the latter's thieves and sheep; Plato's decrepit lion)
  - ridicule (Archilochus' and Aristophanes' ape; Aristophanes' barking bitch; Callimachus' dog, donkey, parrot, and fish).

Other fable characters are automatically (and appropriately) associated with particular

- gods (Achaeus' eagle (Zeus); Achaeus' (and possibly Cercidas') tortoise (Aphrodite); cf. the presentation of Hesiod's hawk as a divine instrument, and the problematic connection of both Callimachus' laurel and olive with Apollo)
- persons (Aeschylus' and Aristophanes' (cf. Plato's) lion: Atridae, Alcibiades; cf. Xenophon's dog: Socrates), or
- professions (Hesiod's nightingale: poet).

These connotations may be stressed by intersection of the context with the fable or *vice versa* (see above). The relationship between fable and context is particularly close in some dramas, in which (allusions to) fables deal with the key themes of the play: house in A. 12F2, storm-sea in S. 13F1, smell-food-drink in Ar. 17A2, feathers in Ar. 17A4, sea in Ar. 17A6.

The genre's chameleonic flexibility to fit its context is strikingly illustrated (and parodied) by Philocleon's instantaneous insertion of an interruption by the addressee into his second Sybaritic fable (17F4; cf. his echoing the bread-seller's oath in his first Aesopic one (17F2)). That fables should resemble their contexts, which is implicitly prescribed by Arist. G5, is apparent also *e contrario*, viz. (apart from Theon's τόπος ἐκ τοῦ ἀνομοίου; G20c) from the comic incongruities in drunken Philocleon's fables, which understandably fail to appease their addressees (cf. the satirical function of a possible incongruity in Timocr. 10A1, as well as the possibly comic incongruities in

Achae. 15A1). Even a minor incongruity (Arist. 39F2) may detract from a fable's persuasiveness (intentionally in Arist. 57A2), but an incongruity (X. 50F1) can also go *a maiore*. On the other hand, two expert Classical orators (Demosthenes, Demades) (allegedly) make their fables (40F2, 41F1) resemble their context so closely that they almost imperceptibly return to their contexts.

The analogy between (an allusion to) a fable and its context (expressed by the devices listed above) may vary greatly, depending upon whether or not the narrator metaphorically represents himself, the addressed, and/or somebody/something else in the fable:

- in many fables both the narrator and the addressee are metaphorically represented in the fable
  - mostly as the two antagonists: Hes. 2F1 (at the first level), Timocr. 10A1 (although Themistocles follows the poet's lead); Ar. 17F1, 17F5 (on both levels), 17A3, 17A5, Hdt. 31F1, (apparently) Menedemus Eretr. 54T1 (D.L.); cf. D. 40F2, Demad. 41F1
    - plus someone/something else (Archil. 4F1a-h, 4F2a-c; Ar. 17F4, 17A1, 17A2 (third function); Call. 20F2; S. 24A1 (Hieronym. Rhod. 55A1); D. 40F1 (Aristobul. 36F1); Pl. 49A1 (at the second level); cf. (perhaps) Phaedo 51A1ab); X. 50F1 (two), a special case, as the addressed is to be the narrator (see below)
  - in some cases the narrator acts as *survenant*. This device creates some distance, which grants the advice given the appearance of objectivity: S. 13F2, Ar. 17F3. In Call. 20F2, however, the *survenant*'s role expresses the insignificant addressee's unwarranted meddlesomeness
  - united (as fellow-sufferers) in one character: A. 12F1, Ar. 17A4 (see below)

- in several other fables, however, the addressed is "present" but the narrator is not: Simon. 9F1; Cerc. 22A1 (in the second interpretation)
  - plus someone/something else (Hes. 2F1 (at the third level); Stesich. 7F2 (Arist. 39F1) (Philist. 33F1?); Timocr. 10F1 (two); S. 13F1; Call. 20F2; D.S. 38F1 (Hieronym. Hist. 37T1?)-2 (two)); Arist. 39F2; Phld. 42A1ab

- in three fables somehow connected with philosophers, con-

versely, only the narrator is, but the addressed is not, represented metaphorically (as the fox (see above)): Pl. 49A2
- plus someone/something else: Pl. 49A1 (at the first level);
  - as the *survenant* (to the same effect as in the above instances): Epicur. 54T1 (Max. Tyr.) (with a general function; see below, 2.2)

- some fables do not represent either the narrator or the addressed but only (an)other person(s): Hes. 2F1 (at the second level); A. 12F2 (on both levels); Ar. 17A6; Antisth. 48F1 (Arist. 52A1) (two) - with a general function (see below)

- in Achae. 15A1 and Cerc. 22A1 (in the first interpretation) it is (more or less) clear whom the principal fable character(s) stand(s) for, but (because of the fragmentary state of preservation of the text) unclear whether or not these are the narrator and/or the addressed

- aetiological fables (see below) and fables adduced, or alluded to, for some (philo)logical (Chrysipp. 56A1; Aristarch. 59A1; cf. Cratem Perg. 60A1) or technical reason (exemplifications of the (use of the) genre (second level) (Arist. 39F1-2, Demetr. 43A1-2) or of some trope (Trypho 61A1)) are typically non-metaphorical.

It is noteworthy that in some of the fables which occur more than once in the present corpus (see above, 1), the metaphorical relationship (*in abstracto*) between the (allusion to the) fable and their contexts is (completely or partially) the same, too:

- completely: Ar. 17A1 + Archil. 4F2a-c (fox-ape-animals ~ speaker-addressee (if perhaps *in absentia* in Archilochus)-audience); Ar. 17A4 + A. 12F1 (eagle ~ (perhaps) both speaker and addressee)

- partially: Ar. 17A5 + 17F5 (eagle ~ addressee); 17A5 + 17A2 (dung beetle ~ narrator)

Conversely, some different fables are (presented as being) told by identical or comparable narrators (apart from Aesop (see above, Chapter I.III, 4.1) and fables preserved by other authors (see the previous section)). Aristophanes has all fables in *Wasps* told by Philocleon, and all fables and allusions in *Birds* by Pisthetaerus; two Soc-

ratics (Plato, Xenophon) have fables told by Socrates (cf. Socr. *ap.* D.L.; Phaedo). The narrators of the fables occurring in Historiography and Rhetorical & Oratorical Prose are not identical but comparable: all are presented as being told by some leader addressing a larger audience.

In several cases more than one level should be distinguished. In some genres and authors (Epic, Lyric, Hellenistic Poetry (but for Theoc. 21T1 (Gal.)), Epigram, Philosophy (except in Plato, Xenophon, and Phaedo)), the (allusions to)—"first-degree"—fables are addressed by the primary narrator (here assumed to be identical with, or at least indistinguishable from, the author or his *persona*) to his primary audience. In the other genres and authors, however, (allusions to)—"second-degree"—fables are (whether orally or in writing)[15] put into the mouth of a secondary narrator (a (dramatic or (pseudo-)historical) character), addressing a secondary audience. When a fable is presented as being told by Aesop (see above, Chapter I.III, 4.1), yet another level is added (converting first- into second-degree, and second- into third-degree fables: e.g. Call. 20F1, Arist. 39F1; Ar. 17F5-6, Socr. 25F1, respectively). The indirect tradition of some (allusions to) fables, as well as indications of the original author of some other fables in allusions (see above, 1), further complicates the matter. Thus, Aristotle preserves both a fable and an allusion of the second degree (Arist. 39F2, 52A1 = Stesich. 7F2, Antisth. 48A1), Demetrius two second-degree allusions (Demetr. 43A1-2 = Arist. 57A1, auct. inc. 58A1), Plutarch and Aelian a third-degree fable (D. 40F1 = Aristobul. 36F1; Stesich. 7F1 = Crates Perg. 60F/A1, respectively), Athenaeus a third-degree allusion (S. 24A1 = Hieronym. Rhod. 55A1), and Diogenes Laertius a fourth-degree allusion (Achae. 15A1 = Menedemus Eretr. 53T1).

In most (allusions to) fables, one *primum* corresponds to one *secundum comparationis* (or rather: *fabulae*). In some cases, however, this relationship is more intricate, as the (allusion to the) fable, either as a whole or only partially, has more than one application to its context, whether within one and the same, or on two different, levels at the same time:

- within one level
  - the fable as a whole, having more than one application

[15] Cf. Ter-Nedden 1994.

- two within the secondary level: A. 12F2
- three within the primary one: Hes. 2F1
- part of the fable, one character corresponding to both the addressee
  - and the narrator
    - simultaneously: A. 12F1 (eagle ~ Patroclus (possibly), Achilles); Ar. 17A4 (eagle ~ Euelpides, Pisthetaerus)
    - successively: S. 24A1 (Hieronym. Rhod. 55A1) (man ~ Euripides, Sophocles)
  - and a third party: Pl. 49A1 (lion ~ Alcibiades, Sparta)

- on two different levels:
  - the fable as a whole, applying to
    - both the primary and the secondary level: Call. 20F1, Arist. 57F1
    - both the secondary and the tertiary level: Ar. 17F5, (perhaps) Socr. 25F1

2.2 *Function*

Most fables and allusions, whether metaphorical or aetiological, have a specific[16] application to their respective contexts. The two *scolia* (6F1, 6A1) and the Hellenistic Epigrams (plus [A.] 23A1), as well as the (allusions to) fables (allegedly) occurring in ethical (Antipho Soph. 45F1, Democr. 47A1, Epicur. 54T1 (Max. Tyr.)) and political (Arist. 52A1 (cf. Antisth. 48F1)) Philosophy (and perhaps Crates 60F/A1), however, resemble fables included in collections in that they have a general[17] application. The fact that most fables have a specific application is not to say that they cannot be made to have a general one, which is clear from Pseudo-Diogenianus' interpretation of Timocreon's Cyprian fable (10T3), as well as from the inclusion of the fable attributed to Demades (41F1) with its context (the anecdote) in the anonymous prose collections; cf. furthermore Ar. 17T20b, 17T38 (Σ, Eust.).

The (predominantly specific) function which (allusions to) fables

[16] Contra Hasubek 1996, col. 187: "Die F<abel>. kann in einen Kontext eingebettet sein, ohne dabei ihre Mehrdeutigkeit zu verlieren".

[17] Contra Christes 1979, 211: "Alle Fabeln, die wir aus der archaischen und klassischen Zeit Griechenlands kennen, erfahren eine spezielle Anwendung." Cf. Perry 1940, 393, 399-400.

have may vary greatly[18], from persuasive to satirical (with different degrees), from explanatory to illustrative:

- persuasive (*dis*suading rather than persuading): Stesich. 7F2 (Arist. 39F1) (Philist. 33F1?); Ar. 17F5; Socr. 25F1 (first level); Arist. 39F2 (first level); D. 40F1 (Aristobul. 36F1) (explicitly D. 40T7 (Isid.) *qua dissuaderet*); Antipho Soph. 45F1; X. 50F1 (twofold); conversely, Cercidas (possibly) once and Plato thrice present the principal fable characters (22A1; 49F2 (both aetiologies; see below), 49A2-3) as examples *worthy* of imitation (the former, however, not without irony)
- satirical: Archil. 4F2a-c (possibly); Timocr. 10F1 (threatening), 10A2; Ar. 17A1; Call. 20F1(see below)-20F2; Antisth. 48F1 (probably); Arist. 52A1 (cf. γελοῖος)
  - critical: Phld. 42A1a (negated by 42A1b); Epicur. 54T1 (Max. Tyr.)
  - multiple: S. 13F2 (admonishing (explicitly ἐνουθέτει))-critical-threatening; D.S. 38F1 (deride-rebuke (explicitly: ἔσκωψεν, ἐπέπληξεν) (first level))
- scaring: Hdt. 31F1; explicitly Stesich. 7T9 (*territi*), Arist. 57T2 (Alex. Aphr.) φοβεῖν (Aesop)
  - menacing: Archil. 4F1a-h; S. 13F1; Ar. 17A5 (the narrator being angry (like in Hdt. and Arist. llcc)[19])
- illustrative: Semon. 5F1 (?); Simon. 9F1 (?), A. 12F1, 12F2 (on both levels); D.S. 38F2 (higher level); Democr. 47A1
  - for fables adduced, or alluded to, either for some (philo)logical reason or to exemplify the (use of the) genre (cf. Ar. 17F1) or a figure of speech, see above
- explanatory: Ar. 17A3; S. 24A1 (combining self-defence and counterattack); D.S. 38F1; Pl. 49A1
  - aetiological: Nic. 3F1, Ibyc. 8F1 (triple); Achae. 15A1 (perhaps); Theopomp. Hist. 35F1; Arist. 57A1 (Demetr. 43A1); auct. inc. 58F/A1 (Demetr. 43A2); cf. Arist. 57A2

[18] Contra Kovacs 1950, 40: "the fable in the classical and the Alexandrian periods was employed for only one purpose: to illustrate explicitly and vividly an idea in the mind of a poet, a historian, a philosopher, or a speaker."

[19] Cf. Arist. 57T3 (Olymp.) θυμουμένῳ; the use of *increpare* in epimythia (Rom. 67, 73 Thiele (*rec. gall.*)).

- entertaining: D. 40F2, Demad. 41F1 (regaining the audience's attention (if only to rebuke them (explicitly 40T5-6 (Σ *in* Luc./Pl.) ἐπιπεπλῆχθαι))
- combinations:
  - critical, illustrative, prospective: Hes. 2F1
  - persuasive and satirical (paratragic): Ar. 17A6
    - (allegedly) conciliatory but (understandably) abusive: Ar. 17F2 (explicitly: καταγελᾷς μου;)-17F4 (explicitly: 'Ὕβριζ')
  - explanatory, comic (paratragic, "parafabulistic"): Ar. 17A4
    - and critical: Ar. 17A2
  - for aetiological fables with a different function or with a secondary aetiological function, as well as for fables with an additional structural function, see below

The particular function of a fable may be emphasized by an internal clue for its evaluation, usually indicating whose example is *un*worthy of imitation:

- within the fable proper (Nic. 3F1 νωθεῖς, ἄφρονα; Stesich. 7T3 (Conon.) ἀδικοῦσαν; Timocr. 10A1; S. 13F1 θρασύν, 13F2 μωρίας, ἄνολβον; Ar. 17F2 θρασεῖα, κακῆς, 17A2 κάκοσμον, 17A3 φλαύρως; Leon. 26F1 κάκιστε; D. 40T (Melanchthon) *stultis*; Arist. 57A1 ἠδίκησε; Epicur. 54T1 (Max. Tyr.) δειλὸς *bis*, πονηρὸς *bis*; cf. the connotation of γναμπτός in Hes. 2F1; Arist. 39F2 κατοικτείραντα (more positively))
- in the promythium (Nic. 3F1 ἄφρονες, κακοφραδίης) or epimythium (Ar. 17T20b (Σ) ἀδίκους; Antipho Soph. 45F1: μὴ παντελῶς...ἀγαθά, τοῦ καλῶς φρονεῖν πένητα; cf. Arch. Mytil. 29F1 τλήμων; positively: Antip. Sid. 27F2 πάνσοφος; Carpyllides 28F1 δικαίοις, εὐσεβίης)

In addition to the functions listed above, (allusions to) fables can also have important[20] structural (transitional) functions, especially in Aristophanes and Plato. Thus, the fables in *Wasps* (Ar. 17F1-5) interconnect the comedy's dicastic and symposiac parts, whereas the allusions in *Birds* (17A3-4) mark the essential crossing of the boundary

[20] Minor correspondences among the applications of (allusions to) different fables include the monetary application of Pl. 49A1 ~ the monetary character of Antipho Soph. 45F1, rivalry among *literati* (Call. 20F1-2, S. 24A1).

between human and animal. The *Phaedo* fable (49F1) prefigures notions central to the dialogue, whereas the *Phaedrus* one (49F2) is a transition between the dialogue's second and third parts; likewise, the allusion in *Theaetetus* (49A3) serves as, and even symbolizes, a transition from the first to the second definition of knowledge. Nicander's fable (3F1) even has a double structural function, which is emphasized by the author's acrostic signature. One may compare the position of several other fables: Hes. 2F1 introducing the δίκη-paraenesis; A. 12F2 foreshadowing Agamemnon's entrance; S. 13F1-2 as culmination of the *agon* between Menelaus and Teucer; Call. 20F2 at the end of the first part of the *Iambs*; Hdt. 31F1 resuming the *Histories*' main theme.

One and the same fable may be used for different ends, which, on the one hand, testifies to the genre's flexibility, and, on the other, sufficiently demonstrates the invalidity of any generalization of one (e.g. the sociological, or a moral) function postulated by some modern theoreticians (see above, Chapter I.I). The function of (allusions to) fables occurring more than once in the present corpus (see above, 1) may be

- identical:
  - exactly: (possibly) Philist. 33F1 ~ Stesich. 7F2; (presumably) D.S. 38F1 ~ Hieronym. Hist. 37 (supposing that the latter was the former's source)
  - *mutatis mutandis*: Ar. 17A1 ~ (possibly) Archil. 4F2a-c (derisive exposure of a fraud)
  - plus an additional, different, function: Demetr. twice (43A1 ~ Arist. 57A1; 43A2 ~ auct. inc. 58F/A1); Arist. 39F1 ~ Stesich. 7F2

- different
  - slightly: Ibyc. 8F1 (if the fragment quoted by Chrysippus is really from the fable), (perhaps) S. 14F1 ~ Nic. 3F1 (different aetiology emphasized); Phld. 42A1ab (giving rival philosophers a taste of their own medicine); Antisth. 48F1 ~ Arist. 52A1 (different political application); Pl. 49A2 ~ Archil. 4F2a-c, Ar. 17A1 (different character emphasized)
  - completely: (in all probability) Timocr. 10F2 ~ Simon. 9F1; Menedemus Eretr. 53T1 (D.L.) ~ Achae. 15A1; Ar. 17A3 ~ Archil. 4F1a-h; Ar. 17A4 ~ A. 12F1; Ar. 17A6 ~ A. 12F1; Theoc. according to Galen (21T1) ~ Ar. 17F6; *Scol.* 6A1 ~

Arist. 57A2 (two different stages of one fable); Aristarch. 59A1 ~ Hes. 2F1; Trypho 61A1 ~ Call. 20F2; Chrysipp. 56A1 ~ Ibyc. 8F1; Ar. 17F5 ~ 17A2 ~ 17A5

- unclear: Semon. 5F2 (?) ~ Ar. 17F5, 17A2, 17A5; Aristias 11F1, Dinol. 16F1, Apolloph. 18F1 ~ Nic. 3F1; Crates 60F/A1 ~ Stesich. 7F1

With this phenomenon—the use of identical fables for different ends—one may compare the use of a fable with a different function than its primary one, or with more than one function at the same time (see above). Thus, (allusions to) aetiological fables can be used to persuade (Ar. 17F6 (unlike Theoc. 21T1 (Gal.)), Cerc. 22A1 (possibly; or represent), Pl. 49F2); mock (Call. 20F1; explicitly 20T9 (*Dieg.*) παρεπικόπτων); or silence (Arist. 57F1) the addressee. Others have a structural (Pl. 49F1-2; see above) or some technical (Demetr. 43A1-2 (second level)) or logical (Chrysipp. 56A1) function. In addition, two other fables (Stesich. 7F2 (Arist. 39F1), Crates 60F/A1; Semon. 5F2 (?), Ar. 17F5, 17A2, 17A5) have a secondary aetiological function.[21]

2.3 *Reception*

The evaluation of (allusions to) fables, if reported at all in, or apparent from, their contexts, may vary, depending upon their function and the person(s) involved, which is in accordance with the varying attitudes toward the genre by some ancient theoreticians (see above, Chapter I.II). *A priori* one would not expect narrators to disapprove their fables; nor are addressees likely to appreciate fables ridiculizing them. This can in most cases be confirmed *a posteriori*:

- The reception of (allusions to) fables by the narrator
  - positive
    - author/primary narrator
      - explicitly: Hes. 2T4 (Plu.) σοφίας; D.S. 38F2 οὐκ ἀσόφως; D. 40T13 (Melanchthon) *mira*; Demetr. 43A2 (auct. inc. 58T1) χάρις, χαριέν τι; cf. Livrea's interpretation of Cerc. 22A1 ῥικνᾶς
    - (secondary) narrator

[21] Compare the multifunctional fables in the *Vita Aesopi*, for which see Van Dijk 1996a, 537.

- explicitly: Ar. 17F2 χαρίεντα; D. 40T4, 40T10b-12 (Zen., *Suda*, Apostol. (Arsen.)) τερπνοῦ
- more implicitly: praising the author to a fable by whom the narrator alludes: A. 12T10 (Ath.) θαυμάσιον[22]; Pl. 49A2 σοφωτάτου (Adimantus)
- negative:
  - author/primary narrator: Arist. 57F1 τοῖς...τὴν ἀλήθειαν ζητοῦσιν ἧττον [*sc.* ἥρμοττεν τοιοῦτον εἰπεῖν μῦθον], 57A2 μὴ καθάπερ, Οὐ...ὀξὺ βλέπων; Socr. 25T1 (D.L.) οὐ πάνυ ἐπιτετευγμένως (apparently referring to the fable's (lack of) poetic qualities)

- The reception of (allusions to) fables by the addressee
  - positive:
    - primary addressee (the reader)
      - explicitly: D. 40T5-6 (Σ *in* Luc./Pl.) τὸ...τοῦ διηγήματος εὔστοχον; Pl. 49T12b (Olymp.) χαριέντως
      - more implicitly: Theon (G20b) refers to four Classical prose fables as examples worthy of imitation (Hdt. 31F1, Philist. 33F1, Theopomp. Hist. 35F1, X. 50F1)
    - secondary addressee
      - explicitly: Ar. 17A6 σοφῶς...εἶπεν; D.S. 38F1 ἐπισημαινομένου δὲ τοῦ πλήθους ὡς ὀρθῶς λέγοντος; cf. D. 40T5-6 (Σ *in* Luc./Pl.) ὀρθῶς); Pl. 49A3 'Ορθῶς λέγεις
      - more implicitly: Arist. 34 ηὐδοκιμηκέναι; D. 40T9-10a, (Phot., *Suda*) ἡδομένους; Demad. 41T1 (*fab. aes.*) πρὸς ἡδονήν, 41T2 (Dati) *amet.* Two Classical orators (Demosthenes, Demades) allegedly exploit the favourable reception of their fables (40F2, 41F1) to give their addressees a good telling-off. This is apparent from the eagerness with which their respective audiences are reported to beseech them to finish their prematurely abbreviated stories. A fable's alleged success implies a favourable reception: D. 40T13 (Melanchthon) *miram...vim, efficacissimam*
  - negative:
    - secondary addressee
      - explicit disapproval (Ar. 17F1 Ὦ σκαιὲ κἀπαίδευτε; 17F5 'Ολίγον μοι μέλει, Οἴμ' ὡς ἀπολῶ σ' αὐτοῖσι κανθάροις;

[22] In the previous sentence, however, θαυμάσιε (like θαυμαστὸν in X. 50F1) conveys irony; cf. LSJ svv (II); Van Dijk 1993c, 155.

17A2 ἄπιστον; cf. S. 13F2 (1162) ματαίου φλαῦρ'; Call. 20F1 οὐ καλῶς ἐδέξαντο)
- more implicitly:
  - *exit* addressee, whether angry (S. 13F1-2 (the addressee of one fable being the narrator of the other) or scared (Hdt. 31F1 (understanding the fable's sarcasm))
  - the addressee prevents the narrator from finishing his fable (Ar. 17F1, 17F5 (taking the narrator with him); cf. 17F2 μή μοι γ' (in vain))
  - the addressee takes legal action against the narrator (17F2 Προσκαλοῦμαί σ'; 17F4 μαρτύρομαι, ἕως ἂν τὴν δίκην ἄρχων καλῇ; more implicitly in 17F3: Ἀλλ' οὖν σὺ μέμνησ' οὗτος ἀπεκρίνατο; cf. Call. 20F1 (execution))

- two fables are explicitly received in two different ways:
  - one by the narrator and audience, viz. positively and negatively, respectively: Ar. 17F2
  - the other depending upon its narrator: Arist. 57F1 (cf. 57T2-3 (Alex. Aphr., Olymp.)) is deemed fit (ἥρμοττεν) for an angry man[23] (Aesop) but not (ἧττον) for veracious men (philosophers)

In view of the manifold interrelationships between the fables and allusions and their contexts studied above, we may conclude by emphasizing that these fables (and other fables not included in collections) should never be studied without taking their contexts into close consideration. Consequently, the collection of Archaic, Classical, and Hellenistic Greek fables (whether told *in extenso* or only alluded to) in Part III of the present study has been made to include their relevant immediate contexts.

[23] The narrators of Hdt. 31F1 and Ar. 17A5 (cf. S. 13F2) are angry, too; see above, n. 19.

PART THREE

TEXTUAL SUPPLEMENT

> "Die Gruppe der außerhalb von Fabelbüchern erscheinenden Fabeln bzw. Fabelanspielungen ist besonders schwer zu erschließen, weil diese Texte weder jemals in einer den modernen Ansprüchen genügenden Gesamtausgabe vereinigt noch in einem zuverlässigen und bequem benutzbaren Repertorium aufgelistet wurden. (...) Wer sich also einen Überblick über das außerhalb der Fabelbücher überlieferte griechisch-römische Fabelgut verschaffen will, muß sich anhand der beiden genannten Verzeichnisse [Perry 1965, Adrados 1979a-1985-1987a] und der über die Ausgaben der Fabelbücher verstreuten Hinweise...in mühseliger Kleinarbeit ein eigenes Repertorium erstellen, ohne allerdings damit rechnen zu können, daß er das einschlägige Textmaterial vollständig erfaßt." (Holzberg 1993, 2)

Legend

The Synopsis given below corresponds both to the analyses in Parts I-II and to the texts in Part III of this book, thus facilitating an overview of, and cross referencing within, the corpus collected and studied.

The Synopsis is bipartite. First, an overview of the ancient testimonies on the theory and terminology of the Genre examined in Part I is given. Then, a Synopsis of the Archaic, Classical, and Hellenistic Greek fables and allusions analysed in Part II is presented, including later testimonies to these. Occasionally, a question mark is added to passages in which it is unclear—notably because of the fragmentary state of the text's preservation—whether or not it is really a fable the author is telling or alluding to.[1] When it cannot be ascertained whether an author told a particular fable *in extenso* or merely alluded to it, one reference is spread over two columns.[2] Passages may—as has been explained in the General Introduction—occur more than once, as authors may take a fable from an earlier, specified, source.[3] Likewise, theoretical passages exemplifying (some aspect of) the

[1] E.g. Semon. 5F2.
[2] E.g. Arist. 34F/A1.
[3] Thus, Pl. 49A3 = Archil. 4T1; Arist. 39F1 = Stesich. 7T1; Arist. 52A1 = Antisth. 48T1.

Genre as such by referring (in one way or another) to a particular Fable or Allusion are included in both lists.[4]

1. *Ancient Genre Theory and Terminology*

G1a Ar. *V.* 566
G1b Ar. *V.* 1183-1185
G1c Ar. *V.* 1256-1261
G1d Ar. *V.* 1393-1394
G2 Ar. *Av.* 471
G3 Pl. *Phd.* 60c-61b
G4 Mnesim. *Φαρμακοπώλης*, fr. 6 *PCG*
G5 Arist. *Rh.* 2.20, 1393a23-1394a18
G6 Chamael. fr. 45 Giordano[2]
G7 Auct. *ad Her.* 1.6.10
G8 Cic. *Inv.* 1.17.25
G9 Cic. *De or.* 2.66.264
G10 Demetr. *Eloc.* 157-158
G11 Liv. 2.32.9
G12 Phaedr. 1.*Prol.*
G13 Phaedr. 2.*Prol.*
G14 Phaedr. 3.*Prol.*
G15a Phaedr. 4.*Prol.*11-13
G15b Phaedr. 4.2.1-7
G16 Phaedr. 5.*Prol.*
G17 Sen. *Polyb. Cons.* 8.3-4
G18a Quint. *Inst.* 1.9.1-3
G18b Quint. *Inst.* 5.11.19-21
G18c Quint. *Inst.* 6.3.44
G19a Babr. *Prooem.* 1
G19b Babr. *Prooem.* 2
G19c Babr. 119.11-12
G20a Theon, *Prog.* 1
G20b Theon, *Prog.* 2
G20c Theon, *Prog.* 3
G21 Luc. Tarrh. fr. 1 Linnenkugel

[4] Thus, Theon G20b = Hdt. 31T1, Philist. 33T1, Theopomp. Hist. 35T1, X. 50T1; Arist. G5 = 39F1-2.

G22 D.Chr. 55.10
G23 D.Chr. 72.13
G24a Plu. *Mor.* 14E
G24b Plu. *Mor.* 16BC
G25a Plu. *Mor.* 152D
G25b Plu. *Mor.* 158B
G25c Plu. *Mor.* 162BC
G25d Plu. *Mor.* 164B
G26 Plu. *Mor.* 871D
G27 Herennius Ph. fr. 32 Palmieri
G28 (Ps.-)Diogenian. *Praef.*
G29 Theo Sm. (p. 73 Hiller)
G30 Suet. *Rhet.* 1 (25.4)
G31 Gell. 2.29.1
G32 Luc. *VH* 2.18
G33 Max. Tyr. 19.2
G34 Max. Tyr. 32.1
G35 Max. Tyr. 36
G36 Σ *in* Il. 19.407
G37 (Ps.-?)Ptol. Ascal. *s.v.* αἶνος καὶ παροιμία
G38 Tat. *Orat.* 34
G39 anon. *Περὶ αἴνου* (p. 154 Bartoletti)
G40a *Vit. Aesop.* 1 GW
G40b *Vit. Aesop.* 7GW
G40c *Vit. Aesop.* 100GW
G41 Hermog. *Prog.* 1
G42 Philostr. (II) *VA* 5.14-16
G43 Philostr. (II/III ?) *Im.* 1.3
G44 Alex. Aphr. *in Mete.* 2.3
G45 *PMich.* 6
G46 Eust. Antioch. *Engast.* 29
G47 Mar. Victor. *Rhet.* 1.17
G48 Fortun. *Rhet.* 2.23
G49 Iul. Vict. *Rhet.* 6.3
G50 Jul. *Or.* 7.3, 207a-d
G51 Jul. *Or.* 10, 306c
G52 Aus. *Ep.* 9 Green
G53 Aus. *Ep.* 12 Green (Symm. *Ep.* 1.32)
G54 Aphth. *Prog.* 1
G55 Him. *Or.* 46.4-5

G56 Him. *Or.* 66
G57 Them. *Or.* 22, 278c
G58 Sopat. Rh. *Prog.*
G59 Avian. *Praef.*
G60 Macr. *Comm.* 1.2.7-11
G61 Syn. *Insomn.* 19, 154D-155A
G62 Mart. Cap. 5.49 (558)
G63 Aug. *c. mend. ad Consent.* 28
G64a Nicol. *Prog.* 1
G64b Nicol. *Prog.* 2
G64c Nicol. *Prog.* 3
G65 Σ *in* Hes. *Op.* 202a
G66a Σ *in* Ar. *Av.* 471b
G66b Σ *in* Ar. *Av.* 651b
G67a Σ *in* Ar. *V.* 1182a
G67b Σ *in* Ar. *V.* 1259a
G68 Σ *in* Od. 14.508
G69a Hsch. *s.v.* Αἰσώπου γελοῖον
G69b Hsch. λ 946
G69c Hsch. μ 1805 Latte
G69d Hsch. σ 2131 Schmidt
G70 Prisc. *Praeex.* 1
G71 Agath. *AP* 16.332
G72 Olymp. *In Grg.* 49.3
G73 anon. *Prol. Phil. Pl.* 2.7
G74a Rom. *Praef.* 1 (*recc. gall./vet.*)
G74b Rom. *Praef.* 2 (*recc. gall./vet.*)
G74c Rom. 26a Thiele (*recc. gall./vet.*)
G75 Isid. *Etym.* 1.40

2. *Fables in Archaic, Classical, and Hellenistic Greek Literature*

Author	Testimonies	Fables	Allusions
I Epic			
1. Hom.	1. Theon, G20c		
	2. Ps.-Diogenian. G28		
	3. Philostr. G43		
	4. Jo. Sard. in *Aphth.* (p. 8 Rabe)		
	5. Doxap. Comm. in *Aphth.* (II 165sq. W)		
	6. Melanchthon, *Util. fab.*		
2. Hes.	1. Aristarch. *in Op.* 210-211 (fr. 7 W)	1. *Op.* 202-212	
	2. Quint. G18b		
	3a. Theon, G20c (II 73 Sp)		
	3bc. ib. (II 74)		
	4. Luc. Tarrh. G21		
	5. Plu. G25b		
	6. Herennius Ph. G27		
	7. Hdn. *Περὶ τῶν εἰς μι* (p. 828 Lentz)		
	8. Clem. Al. *Strom.* 3.5 (42, 2)		
	9. Hermog. G41		
	10. Philostr. G43		
	11. Jul. G50 ?		
	12. Eun. *Hist.* fr. 87		
	13. Macr. 5.16.6		
	14. Nicol. *Prog.* 4.3		
	15. Stob. 3.4.3		
	16. Σ *in* E. *Hec.* 678		
	17a-l Σ (Procl. ?) *in Op.* 202-213a		
	18. Σ *in Il.* G36		
	19. *Hypoth.* Isoc. 1		
	20. Prisc. G70		
	21. Men. Prot. *Exc. de sent.* fr. 35a Müller		
	22a. Choer. *in* Theod. (p. 27 H)		
	22b. ib. 326		
	22c. ib. 328		
	22d. ib. 332		
	23a. *Et. Gen.* α 215 L-L		
	23b. ib. 926		
	24. *Epim. in* Hom. (p. 238 Cramer)		

Author	Testimonies		Fables	Allusions
(2. Hes.)	25.	Jo. Sard. *in Aphth.* (p. 8 Rabe) ?		
	26.	*Suda*, a 230 Adler		
	27a.	Doxap. *Comm. in Aphth.* (II 143 W)		
	27b.	ib. 144		
	27c.	ib. 149		
	27d.	ib. 166		
	28.	Σ *in Aphth.* 1.11 (II 570 W)		
	29a.	Eust. *Il.* A 80		
	29b.	ibid. 113		
	29cd.	ib. Λ 430		
	29e.	ib. Σ 505		
	29f.	ib. Ψ 795		
	30a.	id. *Od.* a 398		
	30b.	ib. μ 85		
	30c.	ib. ξ 508		
	31a-d.	Tz. *in* Hes. *Op.* 200-211		
	32a.	anon. gramm. (*An. Ox.* p. 171)		
	32b.	ib. 201		
	32c.	ib. 209		
	33.	*Et. Gud. s.v.* αἶνος (p. 48.19-21 De Stefani)		
	34.	Greg. Cor. *Dial.* 66 (p. 475 Schaefer)		
	35a.	*EM s.v.* α 513 L-L		
	35b.	ib. 1463		
	35c.	ib. *s.v.* ἱέραξ		
	36.	*Et. Sym.* α 285 L-L		
	37.	Ps.-Zonar. *Lex. s.v.* αἶνος		
	38a-d.	Moschop. *in Op.* 200-210		
	39ab.	*gloss. Cod. Gal. ad Op.* 208-210		
	40.	Ps.-Ammon. *Diff.* 18 (p. 6 Nickau)		
	41.	Apostol. *Praef.* 5		
	42.	Σ *in* Il. (*Cod. Reg.* 3058), sv αἶνος (III 371 Cramer)		
	43.	Abst. *Praef.*		
	44.	Erasm. *Cop.* 2 (p. 254 Knott)		
	45.	Melanchthon, *Util. fab.*		
3. Nic.	1a-k.	Σ *in Ther.* 343-355a	1. *Ther.* 343-358	
	2.	Eutecn. *in Ther.* 343-358		

Author	Testimonies		Fables	Allusions
(3. Nic.)	3.	*Et. Gen.* α 672 L-L		
II Lyric				
4. Archil.	1.	Pl. 49A2	1a-h. fr. 174-181 West	
	2.	Erot. σ 25 (p. 79 N)	2a-c. fr. 185-187 West	
	3.	Theon, G20c	3. fr. 237 West ?	
	4.	Luc. Tarrh. G21		
	5ab.	ibid.		
	6.	D.Chr. G22		
	7.	id. 74.15		
	8.	Herennius Ph. G27		
	9ab.	ibid.		
	10.	Ps.-Diogenian. G28		
	11.	Aristid. *Or.* 3.664 (p. 512 Behr)		
	12.	A.D. *Conj.* 224.2-3 S		
	13ab.	Attic. fr. 2 Des Places *ap.* Eus. *PE* 15.4.4-5		
	14.	Clem. Al. *Strom.* 5.14.127		
	15.	Hermog. G41		
	16.	Philostr. G43		
	17a.	Eus. *PE* 13.13.54		
	17bc.	ib. 15.4.4-5		
	18.	Bas. *Leg. lib. gent.* 9		
	19.	id. *Virt.* 7		
	20.	Jul. G50 ?		
	21.	Stob. 1.3.34		
	22.	Prisc. G70		
	23.	Σ *in* Ar. *Ach.* 120		
	24.	Σ *in* Ar. *Ach.* 279		
	25.	Σ *in* Ar. G66b		
	26.	Σ *in Il.* G36		
	27.	Σ *in* Od. G68		
	28.	Choer. *epimer. in Ps.* (III 114 Gaisford)		
	29.	*Et. Gen.* α 187 L-L		
	30.	Phot. *Bibl.* 248, 437b		
	31.	Jo. Sard. *in Aphth.* (p. 8 Rabe)		
	32.	Doxap. *Comm. in Aphth.* (II 166 W)		
	33a.	*Et. Gud. s.v.* αἶνος (p. 48.17-18 De Stefani)		
	33b.	ib. p. 49.11-13		
	34.	ib. p. 48.18-19		

Author	Testimonies	Fables	Allusions
(4. Archil.)	35. Eust. *Il.* Λ 430		
	36. Eust. *Od.* ξ 508		
	37ab. ibid.		
	38. *EM* α 462 L-L		
	39. *EM s.v.* σκανδάληθρον		
	40. *Et. Sym.* α 256 L-L		
	41. Tricl. *in* Ar. *Ach.* 120		
	42. Tricl. *in* Ar. *Ach.* 279		
	43. Ps.-Ammon. *Diff.* 18 (p. 5 Nickau)		
	44ab. ib. 5-6		
	45. Apostol. *Praef.* 5		
	46ab. ibid.		
	47. Σ *in* Il. (*Cod. Reg.* 3058), sv αἶνος (III 371 Cramer)		
	48ab. ibid.		
5. Semon.	1. Hdn. *Περὶ ὀρθογραφίας*, p. 516 Lentz	1. fr. 9 West 2. fr. 13 West ?	
	2. Ath. 7.54, 299C		
	3. Σ *in Il.* 18.407*b*		
	4. *Et. Gen.* sv ζῷον		
	5. *EM s.v.* ζωΐδιον		
	6. Ps.-Zonar. *Lex. s.v.* Ζῷον		
6. *Scol.*	1. Ath. 15.50, 694E	1. 9, fr. 892 *PMG*	1. 6, fr. 889 *PMG*
	2. ib. 695A		
	3ab. Eust. *Od.* η 125		
7. Stesich.	1. Arist. 39F1	1. 103, fr. 280 *PMG*	
	2. Crates Perg. *ap.* Ael. *NA* 17.37	2. 104 (a), fr. 281 *PMG*	
	3. Conon, *FGrHist*26F1 (*Narr.*).42		
	4. Ael. *NA* 17.37		
	5a. Arist. 39T1a		
	5b. Arist. 39T1b		
	6. Phot. *Bibl.* 186, 139b		
	7. Arist. Lat. *anon.*		
	8. Arist. Lat. *Guil.*		
	9. Abst. *Praef.*		
8. Ibyc.	1. Chrysipp. Stoic., fr. 180.14 *SVF*	1. 61, fr. 342 *PMG*; 32, fr. 313 *PMG* (?)	
	2. Ael. *NA* 6.51		
9. Simon.	1. Ps.-Diogenian. G28	1. 9, fr. 514 *PMG*	
	2. Ath. 7.107, 318F		
	3. *Cod. Paris. suppl. gr.* 676 (p. 79 Cohn)		
10. Timocr.	1. Plu. *Them.* 21.7	1. 4, fr. 730 *PMG*	1. 3 (fr.729 *PMG*). 4-5

Author	Testimonies		Fables	Allusions
(10. Timocr.)	2.	Ps.-Diogenian. G28 (*CPG* I 179)	2. 8, fr. 734 *PMG*	
	3.	ib. 180		
	4.	anon. *Περὶ αἴνου* G39		
	5.	Zen. *cod. Mon.* 525 (I 166 Bühler)		
	6.	Apostol. 7.28		
	7.	Arsen. 23.62		
III Tragedy				
11. Aristias	1.	Ael. *NA* 6.51	1. *TragGrF* I(Snell) 9F8	
12. A.	1.	Ar. *Av.* 807-808	1. *Μυρμιδόνες*, fr. 139 Radt	
	2.	id. *Ra.* 1431-1432	2. *A.* 717-736	
	3.	D.H. *Dem.* 7		
	4.	Ph. *Aet. M.* 49		
	5.	Plu. *Alc.* 16.3		
	6.	Ps.-Diogenian. G28		
	7.	Aristid. *Or.* 2.55 (p. 161 Behr)		
	8.	Gal. *Plac. Hipp. et Pl.* 4.5.17		
	9.	Ael. fr. 22 Hercher		
	10.	Ath. 11.85, 494B		
	11a-d.	Σ *in* Ar. *Av.* 807a-808a		
	12.	Thdr. Stud. *Ep.* 2.162		
	13a.	*Suda*, ει 64 Adler		
	13b.	ib. ο 992		
	13c.	ib. π 3		
	13d.	ib. τ 183		
	14a.	*Suda*, ο 986 Adler		
	14b.	ib. σ 713		
	15.	Eust. *Il.* Ζ 168-170		
	16a-uu.	Tricl. *in A.* 717-736		
	17a-c.	id. *in* Ar. *Av.* 807b-808b		
	18.	Macar. 6.71		
	19.	Arsen. 48.41 (Apostol. 15.88a)		
	20.	Erasm. *Adag.* 2.3.77		
13. S.	1.	Syn. *Ep.* 5.80	1. *Aj.* 1142-1146	
	2a-f.	Σ *in Aj.* 1150-1156b	2. ib. 1150-1156	
IV Satyr Play				
14. S.	1.	Ael. *NA* 6.51	1. *Κωφοί*, fr. 362 Radt	
	2.	Σ *in* Nic. *Ther.* 343-354		
15. Achae.	1.	Menedemus Eretr. 53A1		1. *Ὀμφάλη*, *TragGrF* I(Snell)20F34
	2.	D.L. 2.17 (133)		
	3.	Erasm. *Adag.* 1.7.68		

Author	Testimonies		Fables	Allusions
V Comedy				
16. Dinol.	1.	Ael. *NA* 6.51	1. fr. 8 Kaibel	
17. Ar.	1.	[A.], *AP* 10.110	1. *V.* 1182	1. *Ach.* 120
	2.	Cic. *Att.* 5.10.3	2. ib. 1399-1405	2. *Pax* 127-134
	3.	id. *Tusc.* 1.41	3. ib. 1427-1432	3. *Av.* 652-653
	4.	Val. Max. 7.2.ext.7	4. ib. 1435-1440	4. ib. 807-808
	5.	Plu. *Alc.* 16.3	5. ib. 1448	5. *Lys.* 695
	6.	Symm. *in Av.* 440	6. *Av.* 472-475	6. *Ra.* 1431-1432
	7.	Zen. 1.20		
	8.	Ps.-Diogenian. G28		
	9a.	Diogenian. V 1.65		
	9b.	Diogenian. 2.44		
	10.	anon. *Περὶ αἴνου* G39		
	11.	Gal. *Simp. med. temp.* 11.37 (12.360-361 K)		
	12.	Ael. *NA* 16.5		
	13.	[Hdn.] *Philet.* 2		
	14.	Σ *in Ach.* 120		
	15.	Σ *in Av.* 15		
	16a-l.	ib. 471a-475c		
	17a-c.	ib. 651b-653		
	18a-d.	ib. 807a-808a		
	19a.	Σ *in Lys.* 694a		
	19b.	ibid. 694b		
	20a-c.	Σ *in Pac.* 129α-134b		
	21.	Σ *in Ra.* 1432		
	22.	Σ *in V.* 191d		
	23ab.	ib. 1182ab		
	24ab.	ib. 1403-1405		
	25a-f.	ib. 1428-1432		
	26a-c.	1436a-1440a		
	27ab.	ib. 1446-1448		
	28a.	*Suda*, α 1470 Adler		
	28b.	ib. π 783		
	29.	*Suda*, αι 335 Adler		
	30.	*Suda*, ε 2289 Adler		
	31a.	*Suda*, 2913 Adler		
	31b.	ib. ει 26		
	31c.	ib. τ 953		
	32a.	*Suda*, ει 64 Adler		
	32b.	ib. τ 183		
	33a.	*Suda*, ο 986 Adler		
	33b.	ib. σ 713		
	34.	Tz. *in Av.* 475		
	35ab.	ib. 652-653		
	36.	ib. 808		

Author	Testimonies		Fables	Allusions
(17. Ar.)	37ab.	Tz. *in Ra.* 1431-1432		
	38.	Eust. *Il.* Ω 317-319		
	39a.	Greg. Cypr. 1.57		
	39b.	id. M 1.55		
	40.	Tricl. *in Ach.* 120		
	41a-g.	Tricl. *in Av.* 471b-475d		
	42ab.	ib. 651ab		
	43a-c.	ib. 807b-808b		
	44ab.	Tricl. *in Pac.* 129β-134b		
	45.	Tricl. *in V.* 191d		
	46ab.	ib. 1182ab		
	47a-c.	ib. 1401-1405		
	48a-f.	ib. 1427-1432		
	49a-d.	ib. 1436a-1440b		
	50ab.	ib. 1446-1448		
	51.	Macar. 1.36		
	52.	id. 6.71		
	53.	Apostol. 1.50		
	54.	Apostol. 7.74		
	55.	Σ (Ald) *in Pac.* 134a		
	56a-c.	Σ (Ald) *in V.* 1436b-1440c		
	57.	Arsen. 1.69		
	58a.	Arsen. 24.51		
	58b.	Arsen. 41.21 (Apostol. 13.61a)		
	59.	*Mantiss. prov.* 1.2		
	60.	ib. 2.54		
	61.	Erasm. *Adag.* 2.2.82		
	62.	ib. 2.3.77		
	63a.	ib. 2.6.27		
	63b.	ib. 3.3.67		
	64a.	ib. 3.7.1 (p. 869)		
	64b.	ibid. (p. 883)		
18. Apolloph.	1.	Ael. *NA* 6.51	1. fr. 9 *PCG*	
19. Stratt.	1.	Zen. 2.93		1. fr. 75 *PCG* ?

VI Hellenistic Poetry

20. Call.	1.	Trypho (I), *Trop.* 2.24 (III 206 Sp)	1. *Iamb.* 2(fr. 192 Pf).1-15	
	2.	Luc. Tarrh. G21	2. ib. 4 (fr. 194 Pf). 6sqq	
	3.	Apollon. *Lex. s.v.* ἄειδε		
	4.	Herennius Ph. G27		
	5.	Ps.-Diogenian. G28		
	6.	Clem. Al. *Strom.* 5.8.48		
	7.	ib. 5.14.100		
	8.	Eus. *PE* 13.13.23		
	9.	*Dieg.* 6.22-32		

Author	Testimonies	Fables	Allusions
(20. Call.)	10. *Dieg.* 7.1-18		
	11. Choer. *epimer. in Ps.* (III 114 Gaisford)		
	12. *Et. Gud. s.v.* αἶνος (p. 48.21-23 De Stefani)		
	13. Eust. *Il.* Λ 430		
	14. id. *Od.* ξ 508		
	15. Ps.-Ammon. *Diff.* 18 (p. 6 Nickau)		
	16. Apostol. *Praef.* 5 (*CPG* II 236*sq.*)		
	17. Σ *in* Il. (*Cod. Reg.* 3058), *s.v.* αἶνος (III 371 Cramer)		
21. Theoc.	1. Gal. *Simp. med. temp.* 11.37 (12.360-361 K)		1. 7.23 ?
	2ab. Σ *in* 7.23d-f		
22. Cerc.	1. Stob. 4.16.7		1. fr. 7 Lomiento

VII Epigram

Author	Testimonies	Fables	Allusions
23. [A.]	1. Ar. 17A6		1. *AP* 10.110
24. S.	1. Hieronym. Rhod. fr. 35 Wehrli		1. fr. 4 West
	2. Ath. 13.82, 604D-F		
25. Socr.	1. D.L. 2.5 (42)	1. fr. [1] West	
	2. *APl* 4.16		
	3. *Suda*, σ 829 Adler		
26. Leon.	1. *lemm. ad AP* 9.99	1. 32 Gow-Page, *AP* 9.99	
27. Antip. Sid.	1a. *Suda*, α 687 Adler	1. 63 Gow-Page, *AP* 7.210	
	1b. ib. ε 3246	2. 64 Gow-Page, *AP*	
	6.219		
	1c. ib. η 251		
	1d. ibid. 525		
	1e. ib. κ 1654		
	1f. ib. τ 390		
	2a. *Suda*, α 1510 Adler		
	2b. ibid. 1828		
	2c. ibid. 4172		
	2d. ib. ε 747		
	2e. ibid. 2544		
	2f. ib. λ 869		
	2g. ib. σ 299		
	2h. ibid. 1723		
	3. *lemm. ad AP* 6.219		
	4. *lemm. ad AP* 7.210		
28. Carpyllides	1. *lemm. ad AP* 9.52	1. 2 Gow-Page, *AP* 9.52	

Author	Testimonies	Fables	Allusions
29. Arch. Mytil.	1. *lemm. ad AP* 9.339	1. 23 Gow-Page, *AP* 9.339	
	2. Erasm. *Adag* [illegible]		
30. Arch. Antioch.	1. *lemm.* ib. 34	1. 24 Gow-Page, *AP* 9.343	

VIII Historiography

Author	Testimonies	Fables	Allusions
31. Hdt.	1. Theon, G20b	1. 1.141.1-2	
	2. Doxap. *Comm. in Aphth.* (II 147 W)		
	3. Σ *in* Aphth. (II 10 W)		
32. Th.	1. Σ *in* 4.92.2		
	2. Doxap. *Comm. in Aphth.* (II 147 W)		
33. Philist.	1. Theon, G20b	1. *FGrHist* 556F6	
34. Arist.	1. Σ *in* Ar. *Av.* 471b		1. fr. 573 Rose
	2. Tricl. ibid.		
35. Theopomp. Hist.	1. Theon, G20b	1. *FGrHist* 115F127	
36. Aristobul.	1. Plu. *Dem.* 23.4-6	1. *FGrHist* 139F3	
37. Hieronym. Hist.	1. D.S. 19.25.5-6 ?		
38. D.S.		1. 19.25.5-6	
		2. 33.7.6	

IX Oratory & Rhetoric

Author	Testimonies	Fables	Allusions
39. Arist.	1ab. anon. *in Rh.* 2.20, 1393b8-17	1. G5 (1393b8-22)	
		2. ib. (1393b22-1394a1)	
	2ab. ib. b23-26		
	3ab. Arist. Lat. *anon.*		
	4ab. Arist. Lat. *Guil.*		
40. D.	1. Aristobul. *FGrHist* 139F3	1. fr. 13 Baiter-Sauppe	
		2. ib. fr. 15	
	2. Plu. *Dem.* 23.4-6		
	3. [id.] *Mor.* 848AB		
	4. Zen. 6.28		
	5. Σ *in* Luc. *Herm.* 71		
	6. Σ *in* Pl. *Phdr.* 260c		
	7. Isid. G75		
	8. Phot. *Bibl.* 265, 495a15-30		
	9. Phot. *Lex. s.v.* ὄνου σκιά		
	10a. *Suda*, ο 400 Adler		
	10b. ib. υ 327		
	11. Apostol. 17.69		
	12. Arsen. 51.54		
	13. Erasm. *Adag.* 1.3.52		
	14. Melanchthon, *Util. fab.*		

Author	Testimonies		Fables	Allusions
41. Demad.	1.	*fab. aes.* 63 Hausrath	1. fr. 22 De Falco	
	2.	Leonardo Dati 40 (pp. 298-299 Tacke)		
42. Phld.				1a. *Rh.* 2, fr. 3.11-12 (p. 68 Sudhaus)
				1b. ib.25-27
43. Demetr.				1. G10 (*Eloc.* 157)
				2. ib. (158)

X Philosophy

Author	Testimonies		Fables	Allusions
44. Alcmaeon	1.	Isid. G75		
	2.	Rom. Vind. *Epil.*		
	3.	Conr. Hirs. *Dial. super Avian.* (p. 36 Schepss)		
45. Antipho Soph.	1a.	Stob. 3.16.30	1. 87B54 Diels-Kranz	
	1b.	ib. 4.40.19		
46. Socr.	1.	Pl. *Phd.* 60c-61b		
	2.	Plu. *Mor.* 16C		
	3.	Aug. *Cons. Evang.* 1.12		
	4.	Syn. *Dion* 15		
	5.	Avian. G59		
	6.	Psel. *Orat.* 25.169-174 Littlewood		
47. Democr.	1.	Stob. 3.10.68		1. 68B224 Diels-Kranz
48. Antisth.	1.	Arist. 52A1	1. fr. 100 Caizzi	
49. Pl.	1.	Theon, G20c	1. *Phd.* 60c	1. *Alc.* I 123a
	2.	Zen. 6.28	2. *Phdr.* 259b-d	2. *R.* 2.8, 365c4-6
	3.	Iamb. *in Phdr.* fr. 7 Dillon		3. *Tht.* 200e
	4.	Tim. *Lex.* sv ἀλωπεκῆν		
	5.	Them. *Or.* 21, 246a		
	6a-g.	Herm. *in Phdr.* 258e-259d		
	7.	Herm. *in Phdr.* 272c		
	8.	Σ (Procl. ?) *in Alc.* I 123a		
	9a-d.	Σ *in Phdr.* 259b-260c		
	10.	ib. 272c		
	11.	Σ *in Tht.* 200E		
	12a-c.	Olymp. *in Alc.* 122b-124a		
	13.	Barb. *Aes. fab. Praef.*		
	14.	Abst. *Praef.*		
	15.	Erasm. *Adag.* 1.5.74		
50. X.	1.	Theon, G20b	1. *Mem.* 2.7.13-14	
51. Phaedo	1ab.	Theon, G20c (II 74-75 Spengel)	1ab. *Zopyr.* fr. 1 Rossetti	

Author	Testimonies	Fables	Allusions
52. Arist.	1. Bocc. *Geneal.* 14.9.36-38		1. *Pol.* 3.13, 1284a15-17
	2. Abst. *Praef.*		
53. Menedemus Eretr.	1. Achae. 15T2 2. Achae. 15T3	1. *ap.* Menedemum Eretr. 53T1	
54. Epicur.	1. Max. Tyr. G34		
55. Hieronym. Rhod.	1. S. 24T2		1. S. 24T1
56. Chrysipp. Stoic.			1. fr. 180.14 *SVF*
XI Science			
57. Arist.	1. Demetr. G10	1. *Mete.* 2.3, 356b13-15	1. *HA* 9.32, 619a18-20
	2. Alex. Aphr. *in Mete.* 2.3		2. *PA* 3.2, 663a35-b3
	3. Olymp. *in Mete.* 1.14, 352a17		
	4. Erasm. *Adag.* 1.5.74		
58. auct. inc.	1. Demetr. G10		
XII Grammar & Scholia			
59. Aristarch.	1. Hes. 2T17e (Σ) 2. Hes. 2T31a (Tz.)		1. Hes. 2T1
60. Crates Perg.	1. Ael. *NA* 17.37		1. *ap.* Crates Perg. 60T1
61. Trypho (I)			1. *Trop.* 2.24 (III 206 Spengel)

ANCIENT GENRE THEORY & TERMINOLOGY

G1a Ar. *V.* 566

ΦΙΛΟΚΛΕΩΝ

οἱ δὲ λέγουσιν μύθους ἡμῖν, οἱ δ' Αἰσώπου τι γέλοιον·
οἱ δὲ σκώπτουσ', ἵν' ἐγὼ γελάσω καὶ τὸν θυμὸν καταθῶμαι.

G1b Ar. *V.* 1183-1185

[vide Ar. 17F1]

G1c ib. 1256-1261

ΒΔΕΛΥΚΛΕΩΝ

οὔκ, ἢν ξυνῇς γ' ἀνδράσι καλοῖς τε κἀγαθοῖς.
ἢ γὰρ παρῃτήσαντο τὸν πεπονθότα,
ἢ λόγον ἔλεξας αὐτὸς ἀστεῖόν τινα,
Αἰσωπικὸν γέλοιον ἢ Συβαριτικόν,
ὧν ἔμαθες ἐν τῷ συμποσίῳ· κᾆτ' ἐς γέλων
τὸ πρᾶγμ' ἔτρεψας, ὥστ' ἀφείς σ' ἀποίχεται.

G1d Ar. *V.* 1393-1394

[vide Ar. 17F2]

G2 Ar. *Av.* 471

[vide Ar. 17F6]

G3 Pl. *Phd.* 60c-61b

[vide Socr. 46T1]

G4 Mnesim. *Φαρμακοπώλης*, fr. 6 *PCG ap.* Σ *in* Ar. 471b

[praecedit Σ *in* Ar. G66a]

εἰσὶ δέ τινες οἱ τοὺς βραχεῖς καὶ συντόμους λέγουσι Συβαριτικούς, καθάπερ Μνησίμαχος ἐν Φαρμακοπώλῃ.

[pergit G66a]

G5 Arist. *Rh.* 2.20, 1393a23-1394a18

2.20 Λοιπὸν δὲ περὶ τῶν κοινῶν πίστεων ἅπασιν εἰπεῖν, ἐπείπερ εἴρηται περὶ τῶν ἰδίων. εἰσὶ δ' αἱ κοιναὶ πίστεις δύο τῷ γένει,

παράδειγμα καὶ ἐνθύμημα· ἡ γὰρ γνώμη μέρος ἐνθυμήματός ἐστιν. πρῶτον μὲν οὖν περὶ παραδείγματος λέγωμεν· ὅμοιον γὰρ ἐπαγωγῇ τὸ παράδειγμα, ἡ δ' ἐπαγωγὴ ἀρχή.

παραδειγμάτων δὲ εἴδη δύο· ἓν μὲν γάρ ἐστιν παραδείγματος εἶδος τὸ λέγειν πράγματα προγενομένα, ἓν δὲ τὸ αὐτὸν ποιεῖν. τούτου δὲ ἓν μὲν παραβολὴ ἓν δὲ λόγοι, οἷον οἱ Αἰσώπειοι καὶ Λιβυκοί.

ἔστιν δὲ τὸ μὲν πράγματα λέγειν τοιόνδε τι, ὥσπερ εἴ τις λέγοι ὅτι δεῖ πρὸς βασιλέα παρασκευάζεσθαι καὶ μὴ ἐᾶν Αἴγυπτον χειρώσασθαι· καὶ γὰρ πρότερον [1393[b]] Δαρεῖος οὐ πρότερον διέβη πρὶν Αἴγυπτον ἔλαβεν, λαβὼν δὲ διέβη, καὶ πάλιν Ξέρξης οὐ πρότερον ἐπεχείρησεν πρὶν ἔλαβεν, λαβὼν δὲ διέβη, ὥστε καὶ οὗτος ἐὰν λάβῃ, διαβήσεται, διὸ οὐκ ἐπιτρεπτέον.

παραβολὴ δὲ τὰ Σωκρατικά, οἷον, εἴ τις λέγοι ὅτι οὐ δεῖ κληρωτοὺς ἄρχειν· ὅμοιον γὰρ ὥσπερ ἂν εἴ τις τοὺς ἀθλητὰς κληροίη μὴ οἳ δύνανται ἀγωνίζεσθαι ἀλλ' οἳ ἂν λάχωσιν, ἢ τῶν πλωτήρων ὅντινα δεῖ κυβερνᾶν κληρώσειεν, ὡς δέον τὸν λαχόντα ἀλλὰ μὴ τὸν ἐπιστάμενον.

λόγος δέ, οἷος...

[sequuntur Arist. 39F1 (Stesich. 7T1), 39F2].

εἰσὶ δ' οἱ λόγοι δημηγορικοί, καὶ ἔχουσιν ἀγαθὸν τοῦτο, ὅτι πράγματα μὲν εὑρεῖν ὅμοια γεγενημένα χαλεπόν, λόγους δὲ ῥᾷον· ποιῆσαι γὰρ δεῖ ὥσπερ καὶ παραβολάς, ἄν τις δύνηται τὸ ὅμοιον ὁρᾶν, ὅπερ ῥᾷόν ἐστιν ἐκ φιλοσοφίας. ῥᾴω μὲν οὖν πορίσασθαι τὰ διὰ τῶν λόγων, χρησιμώτερα δὲ πρὸς τὸ βουλεύσασθαι τὰ διὰ τῶν πραγμάτων· ὅμοια γὰρ ὡς ἐπὶ τὸ πολὺ τὰ μέλλοντα τοῖς γεγονόσιν.

δεῖ δὲ χρῆσθαι τοῖς παραδείγμασι οὐκ ἔχοντα μὲν ἐνθυμήματα ὡς ἀποδείξεσιν (ἡ γὰρ πίστις διὰ τούτων), ἔχοντα δὲ ὡς μαρτυρίοις, ἐπιλόγῳ χρώμενον τοῖς ἐνθυμήμασιν· προτιθέμενα μὲν γὰρ ἔοικεν ἐπαγωγῇ, τοῖς δὲ ῥητορικοῖς οὐκ οἰκεῖον ἐπαγωγὴ πλὴν ἐν ὀλίγοις, ἐπιλεγόμενα δὲ μαρτυρίοις, ὁ δὲ μάρτυς πανταχοῦ πιθανός· διὸ καὶ προτιθέντι μὲν ἀνάγκη πολλὰ λέγειν, ἐπιλέγοντι δὲ καὶ ἓν ἱκανόν· μάρτυς γὰρ χρηστὸς καὶ εἷς χρήσιμος.

πόσα μὲν οὖν εἴδη παραδειγμάτων, καὶ πῶς αὐτοῖς καὶ πότε χρηστέον, εἴρηται.

G6 Chamael. fr. 45 Giordano[2] *ap.* Hsch. G69b

Λιβυκοὶ λόγοι· Χαμαιλέων φησὶ Κυβισσὸν ⟨τὸν Λίβυν⟩ εὑρεῖν τοὺς λόγους τούτους.

G7 Auct. ad Her. 1.6.10

Si defessi erint ab audiendo, ab aliqua re, quae risum movere possit, ab apologo... [sc. *exordiemur*]

G8 Cic. *Inv.* 1.17.25

sin res dabit, non inutile est ab aliqua re nova aut ridicula incipere aut ex tempore quae nata sit, quod genus strepitu, acclamatione; aut iam parata, quae vel apologum vel fabulam vel aliquam contineat inrisionem; aut si rei dignitas adimet iocandi facultatem, aliquid triste, novum, horribile statim non incommodum est inicere. nam, ut cibi satietas et fastidium aut subamara aliqua re relevatur aut dulci mitigatur, sic animus defessus audiendo aut admiratione integratur aut risu novatur.

G9 Cic. *De or.* 2.66.264

Ac verborum quidem genera, quae essent faceta, dixisse me puto; rerum plura sunt, eaque magis, ut dixi ante, ridentur; in quibus est narratio, res sane difficilis; exprimenda enim sunt et ponenda ante oculos ea, quae videantur et veri similia, quod est proprium narrationis, et quae sint, quod ridiculi proprium est, subturpia; cuius exemplum, ut brevissimum, sit sane illud, quod ante posui, Crassi de Memmio.

Et ad hoc genus ascribamus etiam narrationes apologorum.

G10 Demetr. *Eloc.* 157-158

157 Καὶ μῦθος δὲ λαμβανόμενος καιρίως εὔχαρίς ἐστιν, ἤτοι ὁ κείμενος, ὡς...

[sequitur Demetr. 43A1 (Arist. 57T1)].

158 Πολλοὺς δὲ καὶ προσπλάσσομεν προσφόρους καὶ οἰκείους τοῖς πράγμασιν, ὥς πέρ...

[sequitur Demetr. 43A2 (auct. inc. 58T1)].

G11 Liv. 2.32

7 *Nullam profecto nisi in concordia ciuium spem reliquam ducere* [sc. *patres*]; *eam per aequa, per iniqua reconciliandam ciuitati esse.* 8 *Placuit igitur oratorem ad plebem mitti Menenium Agrippam, facundum uirum et quod inde oriundus erat plebi carum. Is intromissus in castra prisco illo dicendi et horrido modo nihil aliud quam hoc narrasse fertur:*

9 *tempore quo in homine non ut nunc omnia in unum consentiant, sed singulis membris suum cuique consilium, suus sermo fuerit, indignatas reliquas partes sua cura, suo labore ac ministerio uentri omnia quaeri, uentrem in medio quietum nihil aliud quam datis uoluptatibus frui;* 10 *conspirasse inde ne manus ad os cibum ferrent, nec os acciperet datum, nec dentes quae acciperent conficerent. hac ira, dum*

uentrem fame domare uellent, ipsa una membra totumque corpus ad extremam tabem uenisse. 11 *inde apparuisse uentris quoque haud segne ministerium esse, nec magis ali quam alere eum, reddentem in omnes corporis partes hunc quo uiuimus uigemusque, diuisum pariter in uenas maturum confecto cibo sanguinem.*

12 *Comparando hinc quam intestina corporis seditio similis esset irae plebis in patres, flexisse mentes hominum.*

G12 Phaedr. 1.*Prol.*

Aesopus auctor quam materiam repperit,
hanc ego polivi versibus senariis.
duplex libelli dos est: quod risum movet,
et quod prudenti vitam consilio monet.
calumniari si quis autem voluerit,
quod arbores loquantur, non tantum ferae,
fictis iocari nos meminerit fabulis.

G13 Phaedr. 2.*Prol.*1-12

Exemplis continetur Aesopi genus;
nec aliud quicquam per fabellas quaeritur
quam corrigatur error ut mortalium,
acuatque sese diligens industria.
quicumque fuerit ergo narrandi iocus,
dum capiat aurem et servet propositum suum,
re commendetur, non auctoris nomine.
equidem omni cura morem servabo senis;
sed si libuerit aliquid interponere,
dictorum sensus ut delectet varietas,
bonas in partes, lector, accipias velim,
ita, si rependet illi brevitas gratiam.
cuius verbosa ne sit commendatio,
attende cur negare cupidis debeas,
modestis etiam offerre quod non petierint.
[sequitur Phaedr. 2.1 (*Aes.* 487)]

G14 Phaedr. 3.*Prol.*33-53

sed iam, "quodcumque fuerit," ut dixit Sinon
ad regem cum Dardaniae perductus foret,
librum exarabo tertium Aesopi stilo,
honori et meritis dedicans illum tuis [sc. *Eutychi*].
quem si leges, laetabor; sin autem minus,
habebunt certe quo se oblectent posteri.
Nunc, fabularum cur sit inventum genus,

brevi docebo. servitus obnoxia,
quia quae volebat non audebat dicere,
affectus proprios in fabellas transtulit,
calumniamque fictis elusit iocis.
ego illius pro semita feci viam,
et cogitavi plura quam reliquerat,
in calamitatem deligens quaedam meam.
quodsi accusator alius Seiano foret,
si testis alius, iudex alius denique,
dignum faterer esse me tantis malis,
nec his dolorem delenirem remediis.
suspicione si quis errabit sua,
et, rapiens ad se quod erit commune omnium,
stulte nudabit animi conscientiam,
huic excusatum me velim nihilo minus.
neque enim notare singulos mens est mihi,
verum ipsam vitam et mores hominum ostendere.
rem me professum dicet fors aliquis gravem.
si Phryx Aesopus potuit, si Anacharsis Scythes
aeternam famam condere ingenio suo,
ego litteratae qui sum proprior Graeciae,
cur somno inerti deseram patriae decus,
...?

G15a Phaedr. 4.*Prol.*11-13

Cum destinassem terminum operi statuere,
in hoc ut aliis esset materiae satis,
consilium tacito corde damnavi <meum>.
nam si quis etiam talis est tituli <appetens>,
quo pacto divinabit quidnam omiserim,
ut illud ipse incipiat famae tradere,
sua cuique cum sit animi cogitatio
colorque proprius? ergo non levitas mihi,
sed certa ratio causam scribendi dedit.
quare, Particulo, quoniam caperis fabulis,
(quas Aesopias, non Aesopi, nomino,
quia paucas ille ostendit, ego plures sero,
usus vetusto genere sed rebus novis,)
quartum libellum cum vacaris perleges.
hunc obtrectare si volet malignitas,
imitari dum non possit, obtrectet licet.
mihi parta laus est quod tu, quod similes tui
vestras in chartas verba transfertis mea,

dignumque longa iudicatis memorias.
inlitteratum plausum nec desidero.

G15b Phaedr. 4.2.1-7

Ioculare tibi videmur: et sane levi,
dum nil habemus maius, calamo ludimus.
sed diligenter intuere has nenias;
quantam in pusillis utilitatem reperies!
non semper ea sunt quae videntur: decipit
frons prima multos, rara mens intellegit
quod interiore condidit cura angulo.
hoc ne locutus sine mercede existimer,
fabellam adiciam de mustela et muribus.
Mustela, cum annis et senecta debilis
mures veloces non valeret adsequi,
involuit se farina et obscuro loco
abiecit neclegenter. mus, escam putans,
adsiluit et comprensus occubuit neci;
alter similiter, deinde perit et tertius.
post aliquot venit saeculis retorridus,
qui saepe laqueos et muscipula effugerat;
proculque insidias cernens hostis callidi,
"Sic valeas," inquit, "ut farina es, quae iaces!"

G16 Phaedr. 5.*Prol.*

Aesopi nomen sicubi interposuero,
cui reddidi iam pridem quicquid debui,
auctoritatis esse scito gratia;
ut quidam artifices nostro faciunt saeculo,
qui pretium operibus maius inveniunt novis
si marmori adscripserunt Praxitelen suo,
detrito Myn argento, tabulae Zeuxidem.
adeo fucatae plus vetustati favet
Invidia mordax quam bonis praesentibus.
sed iam ad fabellam talis exempli feror.
[sequitur Phaedr. 5.1 (*Aes.* 523)]

G17 Sen. *Polyb. Cons.* 8.3-4

3 *Non audeo te usque <eo> producere ut fabellas quoque et Aesopeos logos, intemptatum Romanis ingeniis opus, solita tibi uenustate conectas. Difficile est*

quidem ut ad haec hilariora studia tam uehementer perculsus animus tam cito possit accedere; hoc tamen argumentum habeto iam corroborati eius et redditi sibi, si poterit a seuerioribus scriptis ad haec solutiora procedere. 4 *In illis enim quamuis aegrum eum adhuc et secum reluctantem auocabit ipsa rerum quas tractabit austeritas: haec quae remissa fronte commentanda sunt non feret, nisi cum iam sibi ab omni parte constiterit. Itaque debebis eum seueriore materia primum exercere, deinde hilariore temperare.*

G18a Quint. *Inst.* 1.9.1-3

Adiciamus tamen eorum curae quaedam dicendi primordia quibus aetatis nondum rhetorem capientis instituant. 2 *Igitur Aesopi fabellas, quae fabulis nutricularum proxime succedunt, narrare sermone puro et nihil se supra modum extollente, deinde eandem gracilitatem stilo exigere condiscant: uersus primo soluere, mox mutatis uerbis interpretari, tum paraphrasi audacius uertere, qua et breuiare quaedam et exornare saluo modo poetae sensu permittitur.* 3 *Quod opus, etiam consummatis professoribus difficile, qui commode tractauerit cuicumque discendo sufficiet.*

G18b Quint. *Inst.* 5.11.19-21

19 *Illae quoque fabellae quae, etiam si originem non ab Aesopo acceperunt...,*
[sequitur Hes. 2T2]
...nomine tamen Aesopi maxime celebrantur, ducere animos solent praecipue rusticorum et imperitorum, qui et simplicius quae ficta sunt audiunt, et capti uoluptate facile iis quibus delectantur consentiunt:

si quidem et Menenius Agrippa plebem cum patribus in gratiam traditur reduxisse nota illa de membris humanis aduersus uentrem discordantibus fabula,

et Horatius [*Ep.* 1.1.73] *ne in poemate quidem humilem generis huius usum putauit in illis uersibus:*

'quod dixit uulpes aegroto cauta leoni'.

Αἶνον *Graeci uocant et* αἰσωπείους, *ut dixi,* λόγους *et* λιβυκούς, *nostrorum quidam, non sane recepto in usum nomine, apologationem.* 21 *Cui confine est* *παροιμίας* *genus illud quod est uelut fabella breuior et per allegorian accipitur: 'non nostrum' inquit 'onus: bos clitellas'.*

G18c Quint. *Inst.* 6.3.44

Similis in apologis quoque et quibusdam interim etiam historiis exponendis gratia consequi solet.

G19a Babr. *Prooem.* 1

1 Γενεὴ δικαίων ἦν τὸ πρῶτον ἀνθρώπων,
ὦ Βράγχε τέκνον, ἣν καλοῦσι χρυσείην,

μεθ' ἣν γενέσθαι φασὶν ἀργυρῆν ἄλλην·
τρίτη δ' ἀπ' αὐτῶν ἐσμεν ἡ σιδηρείη.
ἐπὶ τῆς δὲ χρυσῆς καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ τῶν ζῴων
φωνὴν ἔναρθρον εἶχε καὶ λόγους ᾔδει
οἵους περ ἡμεῖς μυθέομεν πρὸς ἀλλήλους,
ἀγοραὶ δὲ τούτων ἦσαν ἐν μέσαις ὕλαις.
ἐλάλει δὲ πεύκη καὶ τὰ φύλλα τῆς δάφνης,
καὶ πλωτὸς ἰχθὺς συνελάλει φίλῳ ναύτῃ,
στρουθοὶ δὲ συνετὰ πρὸς γεωργὸν ὡμίλουν.
ἐφύετ' ἐκ γῆς πάντα μηδὲν αἰτούσης,
θνητῶν δ' ὑπῆρχε καὶ θεῶν ἑταιρείη.
μάθοις ἂν οὕτω ταῦτ' ἔχοντα καὶ γνοίης
ἐκ τοῦ σοφοῦ γέροντος ἧμιν Αἰσώπου
μύθους φράσαντος τῆς ἐλευθέρης μούσης·
ὧν νῦν ἕκαστον ἀνθίσας ἐμῇ μνήμῃ
μελισταγές σοι λωτοκηρίον θήσω,
πικρῶν ἰάμβων σκληρὰ κῶλα θηλύνας.

G19b Babr. *Prooem.* 2

Μῦθος μέν, ὦ παῖ βασιλέως Ἀλεξάνδρου,
Σύρων παλαιῶν ἐστιν εὕρεμ' ἀνθρώπων,
οἳ πρίν ποτ' ἦσαν ἐπὶ Νίνου τε καὶ Βήλου.
πρῶτος δέ, φασίν, εἶπε παισὶν Ἑλλήνων
Αἴσωπος ὁ σοφός, εἶπε καὶ Λιβυστίνοις
λόγους Κυβίσσης. ἀλλ' ἐγὼ νέῃ μούσῃ
δίδωμι, φαλάρῳ χρυσέῳ χαλινώσας
τὸν μυθίαμβον ὥσπερ ἵππον ὁπλίτην.
ὑπ' ἐμοῦ δὲ πρώτου τῆς θύρης ἀνοιχθείσης
εἰσῆλθον ἄλλοι, καὶ σοφωτέρης μούσης
γρίφοις ὁμοίας ἐκφέρουσι ποιήσεις,
μαθόντες οὐδὲν πλεῖον ἢ 'μὲ γινώσκειν.
ἐγὼ δὲ λευκῇ μυθιάζομαι ῥήσει,
καὶ τῶν ἰάμβων τοὺς ὀδόντας οὐ θήγω,
ἀλλ' εὖ πυρώσας, εὖ δὲ κέντρα πρηΰνας,
ἐκ δευτέρου σοι τήνδε βίβλον ἀείδω.

G19c Babr. 119.11-12

Ξύλινόν τις Ἑρμῆν εἶχεν· ἦν δὲ τεχνίτης.
σπένδων δὲ τούτῳ καὶ καθ' ἡμέρην θύων
ἔπρασσε φαύλως. τῷ θεῷ δ' ἐθυμώθη,

χαμαὶ δ' ἀπεκρότησε τοῦ σκέλους ἄρας.
χρυσὸς δὲ κεφαλῆς ἐρρύη καταγείσης,
ὃν συλλέγων ἄνθρωπος εἶπεν "Ἑρμεία,
σκαιός τίς ἐσσι καὶ φίλοισιν ἀγνώμων,
ὃς προσκυνοῦντας οὐδὲν ὠφέλεις ἥμας,
ἀγαθοῖς δὲ πολλοῖς ὑβρίσαντας ἠμείψω.
τὴν εἰς σὲ καινὴν εὐσέβειαν οὐκ ᾔδειν."
[Καὶ τοὺς θεοὺς Αἴσωπος ἐμπλέκει μύθοις,
βουλόμενος ἡμᾶς νουθετεῖν πρὸς ἀλλήλους.
πλέον οὐδὲν ἕξεις σκαιὸν ἄνδρα τιμήσας,
ἀτιμάσας δ' ἂν αὐτὸν ὠφεληθείης.]

G20a Theon, *Prog.* 1

ἃ δὲ πρὸ τῆς ὑποθέσεως ἀναγκαῖόν ἐστιν εἰδέναι τε καὶ ἐπιεικῶς ἐγγυμνάζεσθαι, ταῦτα νῦν πειράσομαι παραδοῦναι, οὐχ ὡς οὐχὶ καὶ ἄλλων τινῶν συγγεγραφότων περὶ τούτων, ἀλλ' οὐ μικρόν τι καὶ αὐτὸς ἐλπίζων συλλήψεσθαι τοῖς λέγειν προαιρουμένοις. οὐ γὰρ μόνον τοῖς ἤδη παραδεδομένοις γυμνάσμασιν ἕτερα ἄττα ἐπεξεύρομεν, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἑκάστου ὅρον ἐπειράθημεν ἀποδοῦναι, ὥστε ἐρωτηθέντα, τί ἐστιν ἕκαστον αὐτῶν, ἔχειν εἰπεῖν, οἷον ὅτι μῦθός ἐστι λόγος ψευδὴς εἰκονίζων ἀλήθειαν, ἔτι τε καὶ τὴν διαφορὰν αὐτῶν πρὸς ἄλληλα δεδηλώκαμεν, καὶ τὰς ἀφορμὰς τῶν εἰς ἕκαστον λόγων παραδεδώκαμεν, προσυπεδείξαμεν δὲ καὶ ὡς ἄν τις αὐτοῖς ἐπιμελέστατα χρήσαιτο.

G20b Theon, *Prog.* 2

Πρῶτον μὲν ἁπάντων χρὴ τὸν διδάσκαλον ἑκάστου γυμνάσματος εὖ ἔχοντα παραδείγματα ἐκ τῶν παλαιῶν συγγραμμάτων ἀναλεγόμενον προστάττειν τοῖς νέοις ἐκμανθάνειν, οἷον χρείας μέν... μύθου δὲ ὁποῖός ἐστι...

[sequuntur Hdt. 31T1 Philist. 33T1 Theopomp. Hist. 35T1 X. 50T1]

G20c Theon, *Prog.* 3

ΠΕΡΙ ΜΥΘΟΥ

Μῦθός ἐστι λόγος ψευδὴς εἰκονίζων ἀλήθειαν, εἰδέναι δὲ χρή, ὅτι μὴ περὶ παντὸς μύθου τὰ νῦν ἡ σκέψις ἐστίν, ἀλλ' οἷς μετὰ τὴν ἔκθεσιν ἐπιλέγομεν τὸν λόγον, ὅτου εἰκών ἐστιν· ἔσθ' ὅτε μέντοι τὸν λόγον εἰπόντες ἐπεισφέρομεν τοὺς μύθους. καλοῦνται δὲ Αἰσώπειοι καὶ Λιβυστικοὶ ἢ Συβαριτικοί τε καὶ Φρύγιοι καὶ Κιλίκιοι καὶ Κα-

ρικοὶ Αἰγύπτιοι καὶ Κύπριοι· τούτων δὲ πάντων μία ἐστὶ πρὸς ἀλλήλους διαφορά, τὸ προσκείμενον αὐτῶν ἑκάστου ἴδιον γένος, οἷον Αἴσωπος εἶπεν, ἢ Λίβυς ἀνήρ, ἢ Συβαρίτης, ἢ Κυπρία γυνή, καὶ τὸν αὐτὸν τρόπον ἐπὶ τῶν ἄλλων· ἐὰν δὲ μηδεμία ὑπάρχῃ προσθήκη σημαίνουσα τὸ γένος, κοινοτέρως τὸν τοιοῦτον Αἰσώπειον καλοῦμεν. οἱ δὲ λέγοντες τοὺς μὲν ἐπὶ τοῖς ἀλόγοις ζώοις συγκειμένους τοιούσδε εἶναι, τοὺς δὲ ἐπ' ἀνθρώποις τοιούσδε, τοὺς μὲν ἀδυνάτους τοιούσδε, τοὺς δὲ δυνατῶν ἐχομένους τοιούσδε, εὐήθως μοι ὑπολαμβάνειν δοκοῦσιν· ἐν πᾶσι γὰρ τοῖς προειρημένοις εἰσὶν ἅπασαι αἱ ἰδέαι. Αἰσώπειοι δὲ ὀνομάζονται ὡς ἐπίπαν, οὐχ ὅτι Αἴσωπος πρῶτος εὑρετὴς τῶν μύθων ἐγένετο, (...

[sequuntur Hom. 1T1 Hes. 2T3a Archil. 4T3]

..., καὶ δὴ καὶ Κόννις ὁ Κίλιξ, καὶ Θοῦρος ὁ Συβαρίτης, καὶ Κυβισσὸς ἐκ Λιβύης, μνημονεύονται ὑπό τινων ὡς μυθοποιοί) ἀλλ' ὅτι Αἴσωπος αὐτοῖς μᾶλλον κατακόρως καὶ δεξιῶς ἐχρήσατο· ὥσπερ Ἀριστοφάνειόν τι μέτρον καὶ Σαπφικὸν καὶ Ἀλκαϊκὸν καὶ ἄλλο ἀπ' ἄλλου λέγεται, οὐχ ὡς τούτων τῶν ποιητῶν μόνων ἢ πρώτων ἐξευρηκότων τὰ μέτρα, ἀλλ' ὅτι αὐτοῖς ἐπὶ τὸ πλεῖστον ἐχρήσαντο. προσαγορεύουσι δὲ αὐτοὺς τῶν μὲν παλαιῶν οἱ ποιηταὶ μᾶλλον αἴνους, οἱ δὲ μύθους· πλεονάζουσι δὲ μάλιστα οἱ καταλογάδην συγγεγραφότες τὸ λόγους ἀλλὰ μὴ μύθους καλεῖν, ὅθεν λέγουσι καὶ τὸν Αἴσωπον λογοποιόν. ...

[sequitur Pl. 49T1]·

...εἴρηται δὲ μῦθος οἷον λόγος τις ὤν, ἐπεὶ καὶ μυθεῖσθαι τὸ λέγειν ἐκάλουν οἱ παλαιοί· αἶνος δὲ ὅτι καὶ παραίνεσίν τινα περιέχει· ἀναφέρεται γὰρ ὅλον τὸ πρᾶγμα εἰς χρησίμην ὑποθήκην· νῦν μέντοι καὶ τὰ αἰνίγματα αἴνους τινὲς καλοῦσι. καὶ τοῦτο τὸ γύμνασμα· καὶ γὰρ ἀπαγγέλλομεν τὸν μῦθον καὶ κλίνομεν καὶ συμπλέκομεν αὐτὸν διηγήματι, καὶ ἐπεκτείνομεν καὶ συστέλλομεν, ἔστι δὲ καὶ ἐπιλέγειν αὐτῷ τινὰ λόγον, καὶ αὖ λόγου τινὸς προτεθέντος, μῦθον ἐοικότα αὐτῷ συμπλάσασθαι· ἔτι δὲ πρὸς τούτοις ἀνασκευάζομεν καὶ κατασκευάζομεν. τὴν μὲν ἀπαγγελίαν ἥτις ἐστί, καὶ ἐν τῷ περὶ τῆς χρείας δεδηλώκαμεν, ἐν δὲ τοῖς μύθοις ἁπλουστέραν τὴν ἑρμηνείαν εἶναι δεῖ καὶ προσφυῆ, καὶ ὡς δυνατόν, ἀκατάσκευόν τε καὶ σαφῆ· διὸ καὶ προεκμανθάνειν δεῖ, ὅσους καὶ παρὰ τοῖς παλαιοῖς ἔστιν εὑρεῖν οὕτως ἀπηγγελμένους· χρήσιμον δὲ καὶ τὸ ὁλοκλήρου τινὸς εἰρημένου μύθου ἐθισθῆναι τὸν μανθάνοντα χαριέντως ἐκ τῶν μύθων ἄρξασθαι, ὥσπερ...

[sequuntur Hes. 2T3bc].

κλιτέον δὲ τοὺς μύθους καὶ τὴν χρείαν εἴς τε τοὺς ἀριθμοὺς καὶ τὰς

πλαγίας πτώσεις, μάλιστα δὲ ἐμμελετητέον ταῖς αἰτιατικαῖς, ὅτι καὶ οἱ παλαιοὶ τοὺς πλείστους τῶν μύθων οὕτως ἀπήγγειλαν, καὶ μάλα ὀρθῶς, ὥς φησιν Ἀριστοτέλης· οὐ γὰρ ἐκ τοῦ αὐτῶν προσώπου λέγουσιν, ἀλλ' ἐπὶ τὸ ἀρχαῖον ἀναφέρουσιν, ἵνα παραμυθήσωνται τὸ δοκεῖν ἀδύνατα λέγειν. οὐκ ἀεὶ δὲ χρὴ καθάπερ ἠναγκασμένῳ τινὶ ἕπεσθαι νόμῳ τῇ τῆς προκειμένης πτώσεως ἀκολουθίᾳ, ἀλλ' ἔνια προσακτέον, καὶ μικτῷ τρόπῳ χρῆσθαι, ὡς προκεῖσθαι μὲν ἄλλην τινὰ πτῶσιν, μεταβεβληκέναι δὲ ἐν τοῖς ἑξῆς εἰς ἑτέραν· ἐπιτερπέστερον γὰρ τούτου τὸ καὶ ποικίλον· ὁποῖός...

[sequuntur Phaedo 51T1ab].

συμπλέκομεν δὲ ὧδε· ἐκθέμενοι τὸν μῦθον ἐπιφέρομεν διήγημα, ὡς ἔοικεν, ἢ ἀνάπαλιν τὸ μὲν διήγημα πρότερον, ὕστερον δὲ τὸν μῦθον, οἷον πεπλασμένον, ὅτι

κάμηλος ἐπιθυμήσασα κεράτων καὶ τῶν ὤτων ἐστερήθη·

τοῦτο προειπόντες ἐποίσομεν τὸ διήγημα τοῦτον τὸν τρόπον·

παραπλήσιόν μοι δοκεῖ τι παθεῖν τῇ καμήλῳ ταύτῃ καὶ Κροῖσος ὁ Λυδός, καὶ ὅλον ἐφεξῆς τὸ διήγημα τὸ περὶ αὐτόν.

ἐπεκτείνομεν δὲ τὰς ἐν τῷ μύθῳ προσωποποιΐας μηκύνοντες, καὶ ποταμὸν ἤ τι τῶν τοιούτων ἐκφράζοντες· τὸ ἐναντίον δὲ ποιοῦντες συστέλλομεν. ἐπιλέγομεν δὲ ὧδε, ὅταν μύθου ῥηθέντος ἐοικότα τινὰ γνωμικὸν αὐτῷ λόγον ἐπιχειρῶμεν κομίζειν, οἷον

κύων παρὰ ποταμόν τινα φέρων κρέας, καὶ κατὰ τοῦ ὕδατος τὴν αὑτοῦ σκιὰν θεασάμενος, οἰηθεὶς ἕτερον εἶναι κύνα μεῖζον κρέας ἔχοντα, ὃ μὲν εἶχεν ἀπέβαλεν, ἁλόμενος δὲ εἰς τὸν ποταμὸν ὡς ἁρπάσων, ὑποβρύχιος ἐγένετο.

τὸν λόγον δὲ οὕτως ἐποίσομεν·

ὅτι ἄρα πολλάκις οἱ τῶν μειζόνων ὀρεγόμενοι καὶ ἑαυτοὺς πρὸς αὐτοῖς τοῖς ὑπάρχουσιν ἀπολλύουσιν.

γένοιντο δ' ἂν καὶ ἑνὸς μύθου πλείονες ἐπίλογοι, ἐξ ἑκάστου τῶν ἐν τῷ μύθῳ πραγμάτων τὰς ἀφορμὰς ἡμῶν λαμβανόντων, καὶ ἀνάπαλιν ἑνὸς ἐπιλόγου πάμπολλοι μῦθοι ἀπεικασμένοι αὐτῷ. τὴν γὰρ τοῦ ἐπιλόγου δύναμιν ἁπλῆν προτείναντες προστάξομεν τοῖς νέοις μῦθόν τινα πλάσαι τῷ προτεθέντι πράγματι οἰκεῖον· προχείρως δὲ τοῦτο ποιεῖν δυνήσονται πολλῶν ἐμπλησθέντες μύθων, τοὺς μὲν ἐκ τῶν παλαιῶν συγγραμμάτων ἀνειληφότες, τοὺς δὲ καὶ αὐτοὶ μόνον ἀκούσαντες, τοὺς δὲ καὶ παρ' ἑαυτῶν ἀναπλάσαντες. ἀνασκευάσομεν δὲ καὶ κατασκευάσομεν τοῦτον τὸν τρόπον· ἐπεὶ γὰρ καὶ αὐτὸς ὁ μυθοποιὸς ὁμολογεῖ καὶ ψευδῆ καὶ ἀδύνατα συγγράφειν, πιθανὰ δὲ καὶ ὠφέλιμα, ἀνασκευαστέον μὲν δεικνύντας, ὅτι ἀπίθανα καὶ ἀσύμφορα λέγει· κατασκευαστέον δὲ ἐκ τῶν ἐναντίων·

ταῦτα γάρ ἐστι τὰ ἀνωτάτω κεφάλαια, εἰς ἃ τὰ κατὰ μέρος ἐμπίπτει. τὸ μὲν οὖν προοίμιον πρόσφορον εἶναι δεῖ τῷ μύθῳ· μετὰ δὲ τὸ προοίμιον ἐκθέσθαι δεῖ τὸν μῦθον, ἐνίοτε δὲ καὶ παρατίθεσθαι, ὅπερ ἐν ὑποθέσει οὐκ ἀναγκαῖον ἀεὶ διηγεῖσθαι· ἔπειτα δὲ μεταβαίνειν ἐπὶ τὴν ἐπιχείρησιν καὶ ἀνασκευάζειν τῶν εἰρημένων ἕκαστον ἐν μέρει, ἀπὸ τῶν πρώτων ἀρξάμενους, καὶ πρὸς ἕκαστον μέρος τοῦ μύθου ἐφ' ἑκάστου τόπου λόγων εὐπορεῖν πειρωμένους· ληπτέον δὲ τὰ ἐπιχειρήματα ἐκ τόπων τῶνδε, ἐκ τοῦ ἀσαφοῦς, ἐκ τοῦ ἀπιθάνου, ἐκ τοῦ ἀπρεποῦς, ἐκ τοῦ ἐλλιποῦς, ἐκ τοῦ πλεονάζοντος, ἐκ τοῦ ἀσυνήθους, ἐκ τοῦ μαχομένου, ἐκ τῆς τάξεως, ἐκ τοῦ ἀσυμφόρου, ἐκ τοῦ ἀνομοίου, ἐκ τοῦ ψευδοῦς. ἀσάφεια μὲν οὖν γίνεται ἤτοι δι' ἓν ὄνομα ἢ καὶ πλείονα· δι' ἓν μὲν ὅταν τις ὀνόμασι χρήσηται ἢ παρὰ τὰ εἰωθότα ἢ ὁμωνύμως, διὰ πλείω δὲ ὅταν δυνατὸν ᾖ μηδενὸς μήτε προστιθεμένου μήτε ἀφαιροῦντος πολλαχῶς ἐκδέχεσθαι τὸ εἰρημένον, οἷον

ἐγώ σ' ἔθηκα δοῦλον ὄντ' ἐλεύθερον.

οὐ γὰρ σαφές, πότερον ἐλεύθερον ἔθηκεν ἀντὶ δούλου, ἢ δοῦλον ἀντ' ἐλευθέρου. ἀκριβέστερον δὲ μικρὸν ὕστερον περὶ τῆς σαφηνείας ἐν τῷ περὶ διηγήματος ῥηθήσεται. τὸ δὲ ἀπίθανόν ἐστι τὸ δυνατὸν μὲν γενέσθαι ἢ λελέχθαι, ἀπιστούμενον δὲ εἰ γέγονεν ἢ εἴρηται ἤτοι διὰ πρόσωπον, ἐφ' ὃ ἡ πρᾶξις ἢ ὁ λόγος ἀναφέρεται, ἢ διὰ τὸν τόπον, ἐν ᾧ λέγεται γενέσθαι τι ἢ εἰρῆσθαι, ἢ διὰ τὸν χρόνον, καθ' ὃν λέγεταί τι γενέσθαι ἢ λελέχθαι, ἢ διὰ τὸν τρόπον τῆς πράξεως ἢ τοῦ λόγου, ἢ διὰ τὴν αἰτίαν τῶν αὐτῶν τούτων λεγόντων ἡμῶν ὅτι οὐκ εἰκός ἐστι τῷ τοιούτῳ τόδε τι πρᾶξαι ἢ τόδε τι εἰπεῖν, ἐν τούτῳ τῷ τόπῳ, ἢ κατὰ τοῦτον τὸν [τόπον ἢ] χρόνον, ἢ τοῦτον τὸν τρόπον, ἢ διὰ ταύτην τὴν αἰτίαν. ὁ αὐτὸς δὲ λόγος ἐστὶ καὶ περὶ τοῦ ἀπρεποῦς. τὸ δ' ἐλλιπὲς τὸ πλεονάζον ἐστίν, ὅταν τι τῶν ῥηθήσεσθαι δυναμένων παραλίπῃ, ἢ εἴπῃ τι μηδὲν ὄν, οἷον ἢ πρόσωπον ἢ πρᾶγμα ἢ χρόνον ἢ τρόπον ἢ τόπον ἢ αἰτίαν ἤ τι τῶν τοιούτων. τὸ δὲ ἀσυνηθές ἐστι τὸ παρὰ τὴν πεπιστευμένην ἱστορίαν, ἢ τὸ παρὰ τὰς κοινὰς ὑπολήψεις λεγόμενον, οἷον εἴ τις τοὺς ἀνθρώπους μὴ πεπλάσθαι εἴποι ὑπὸ τοῦ Προμηθέως, ἀλλ' ὑπ' ἄλλου τινὸς τῶν θεῶν, ἢ τὸν ὄνον φρόνιμον εἴποι, ἢ ἀνόητον τὴν ἀλώπεκα. ὁ δὲ ἐκ τοῦ μαχομένου τόπος τοιοῦτός ἐστιν, ὅταν δείξωμεν αὐτὸν ἑαυτῷ μαχόμενον τὸν μυθογράφον· τούτῳ δὲ χρηστέον οὐκ ἐν ἀρχῇ, ἀλλ' ὅταν τι τῶν μέσων ἢ τελευταίων ἀνασκευάζωμεν, ἔπειτα καὶ ἐναντίον αὐτὸ δεικνύωμεν τοῖς προειρημένοις. ἀπό γε μὴν τῆς τάξεως ἐπιχειρήσομεν ἐλέγχοντες, ἃ μὲν ἔδει πρῶτον ἐν τῷ μύθῳ ῥηθῆναι, οὐκ ἐν πρώτοις ἀπηγγελμένα· ἃ δὲ ἐπὶ τελευτῆς, ἀλλαχοῦ προκείμενα· καὶ

ὅλως ἕκαστον ὡς ἂν δυναίμεθα, οὐ κατὰ τὴν προσήκουσαν τάξιν εἰρημένον. καὶ μὴν καὶ ὁ ἐκ τοῦ ἀσυμφόρου τόπος σαφής ἐστιν, ᾧ καὶ μᾶλλον χρησόμεθα εἰς ἀνασκευὴν τοῦ ἐπιλόγου. οἱ δὲ ἐκ τοῦ ἀνομοίου καὶ τοῦ ψευδοῦς μόνον εἰσὶ τοῦ ἐπιλόγου ἀνασκευαστικοί· ἐκ μὲν οὖν τοῦ ἀνομοίου, ἐπειδὰν τὰ ἐν τῷ μύθῳ κατὰ μηδὲν ἢ μὴ πάντῃ τῷ ἐπιλόγῳ προσεοικότα ὑπάρχῃ· ἐκ δὲ τοῦ ψευδοῦς, ὅταν μὴ κατὰ πᾶν συμβαίνῃ, ὥς φησιν ὁ μυθογράφος, ὅτι

οἱ τῶν πλειόνων ὀρεγόμενοι καὶ τῶν ὄντων στερίσκονται·

οὐ γὰρ ἀεὶ τοῦτο ἀληθές ἐστιν. ἐκ δὲ τῶν ἐναντίων τόπων κατασκευάσομεν. ἀνακεφαλαιοῦσθαι δὲ χρή, ὅταν πολλαὶ καὶ ἰσχυραὶ ὦσιν ἀνασκευαὶ καὶ κατασκευαί, ἐπεὶ ὅταν ὀλίγαι καὶ ἀσθενεῖς, οὐ παραληπτέον τὴν ἀνακεφαλαίωσιν. χρησόμεθα δὲ ἐνταῦθα καὶ τῷ διασύρειν, καὶ αὐξήσεσιν ἢ μειώσεσιν, καὶ παρεκβάσεσι, καὶ ἤθεσι καὶ ἁπλῶς πάσαις ταῖς τῶν λόγων ἰδέαις· καθάπερ γὰρ εἴπομεν, σμικρὸν διαλλάττει τὸ γύμνασμα τοῦτο τῆς δικανικῆς ὑποθέσεως. οἱ δ' αὐτοὶ τόποι χρήσιμοι καὶ πρὸς τὴν τῶν διηγημάτων ἀνασκευήν τε καὶ κατασκευήν.

G21 Luc. Tarrh. fr. 1 Linnenkugel *ap.* Ps.-Ammon. *Diff.* 18 (pp. 5-6 Nickau)

αἶνος καὶ παροιμία διαφέρει. ὁ μὲν γὰρ αἶνός ἐστι λόγος κατὰ ἀνάπλασιν μυθικὴν ἀπὸ ἀλόγων ζῴων ἢ φυτῶν πρὸς ἀνθρώπους εἰρημένος, ὥς φησιν Λούκι⟨λλ⟩ος Ταρραῖος ἐν τῷ πρώτῳ παροιμιῶν, οἷον ἀπὸ μὲν ἀλόγων ζῴων, ὡς...

[sequuntur Archil. 4T4-5ab Hes. 2T4]

ἀπὸ δὲ φυτῶν, ὡς...

[sequitur Call. 20T2]

καὶ ἔστιν ὁ αἶνος ἐξηπλωμένη παροιμία μετὰ διηγήσεως ἀπαρτίζουσα τὸ νοούμενον πρὸς παραμυθίαν τε καὶ ὠφέλειαν ἀνθρώπων. παροιμία δὲ τὴν ἀπὸ κεφαλαίου ἐπὶ τὸ χεῖρον ἀναφορὰν ἔχει ἐνδέουσαν τοῦ αἴνου, καὶ τὴν ἔξωθεν ἐνδεχομένη μετάβασιν. οἷον "μένε βοῦς ποτε βοτάνη⟨ν⟩" καὶ "ἁ κισσὸς μετ' ἀνθεστήρια".

G22 D.Chr. 55.10

καὶ μὴν εἰκάσαι καὶ παραβαλεῖν ἱκανώτατοι ἦσαν [*sc.* Σωκράτης τε καὶ Ὅμηρος]. -Τοῦτο μὲν θαυμαστόν, εἰ ταῖς Ὁμήρου παραβολαῖς πυρὸς καὶ ἀνέμων καὶ θαλάττης καὶ ἀετῶν καὶ ταύρων καὶ λεόντων καὶ τῶν ἄλλων, οἷς ἐκόσμησε τὴν ποίησιν Ὅμηρος, σὺ παραβαλεῖν ἀξιώσεις τοὺς Σωκράτους κεραμέας καὶ [τοὺς] σκυτοτόμους.

10 Εἴπερ γε, ὦ μακάριε, καὶ...

[sequitur Archil. 4T6]

...τοῖς λέουσι καὶ ταῖς παρδάλεσι παραβάλλομεν καὶ οὐδὲν ἢ μὴ πολὺ ἀποδεῖν φαμεν.

ἀλλὰ γὰρ ἴσως καὶ τῶν Ὁμήρου τὰ τοιαῦτα ἀποδοκιμάζεις, ὅπου μέμνηται ψαρῶν ἢ κολοιῶν ἢ ἀκρίδων ἢ δαλοῦ ἢ τέφρας ἢ κυάμων τε καὶ ἐρεβίνθων ἢ λικμῶντας ἀνθρώπους πεποίηκεν, ἀλλὰ ταῦτά σοι δοκεῖ τὰ φαυλότατα εἶναι τῶν Ὁμήρου· 11 μόνους δὲ θαυμάζεις τοὺς λέοντας καὶ τοὺς ἀετοὺς καὶ τὰς Σκύλλας καὶ τοὺς Κύκλωπας, οἷς ἐκεῖνος ἐκήλει τοὺς ἀναισθήτους, ὥσπερ αἱ τίτθαι τὰ παιδία διηγούμεναι τὴν Λάμιαν. καὶ μὴν ὥσπερ Ὅμηρος διά τε μύθων καὶ ἱστορίας ἐπεχείρησε τοὺς ἀνθρώπους παιδεύειν, σφόδρα ἐργώδεις ὄντας παιδευθῆναι, καὶ Σωκράτης πολλάκις ἐχρῆτο τῷ τοιούτῳ, ποτὲ μὲν σπουδάζειν ὁμολογῶν, ποτὲ δὲ παίζειν προσποιούμενος, τούτου ἕνεκεν ἀνθρώπους ὠφέλει· ἴσως δὲ προσέκρουσε τοῖς μυθολόγοις καὶ τοῖς συγγραφεῦσιν.

G23 D.Chr. 72.13

13 εἰσὶ δὲ οἳ καὶ τὸν Αἴσωπον οἴονται τοιοῦτόν τινα γενέσθαι [*sc.* ὁμοίως ξυμφέρον πᾶσιν εἰδέναι καὶ πείθεσθαι], σοφὸν μὲν καὶ φρόνιμον, αἱμύλον δὲ ἄλλως καὶ ξυνθεῖναι λόγους ἱκανόν, οἵων ⟨οἱ⟩ ἄνθρωποι ἥδιστ' ἂν ἀκούοιεν. καὶ τυχὸν ⟨οὐ⟩ παντάπασι ψευδῆ οἴονται καὶ τῷ ὄντι Αἴσωπος τοῦτον τὸν τρόπον ἐπειρᾶτο νουθετεῖν τοὺς ἀνθρώπους καὶ ἐπιδεικνύναι αὐτοῖς ἅττα ἁμαρτάνουσιν, ὡς ἂν μάλιστα ἠνείχοντο αὐτόν, ἡδόμενοι ἐπὶ τῷ γελοίῳ καὶ τοῖς μύθοις· ὥσπερ τὰ παιδία ταῖς τίτθαις μυθολογουμέναις προσέχουσί τε καὶ ἥδονται. ἀπὸ δὴ τῆς τοιαύτης δόξης, ὡς καὶ παρ' ἡμῶν ἀκουσόμενοί τι τοιοῦτον οἷον Αἴσωπος ἔλεγεν ἢ ὁποῖον Σωκράτης ἢ [ὁποῖα] Διογένης, προσίασι καὶ ἐνοχλοῦσι καὶ οὐ δύνανται ἀπέχεσθαι, ὃν ἂν ἴδωσιν ἐν τούτῳ τῷ σχήματι,

οὐ μᾶλλον ἢ τὰ ὄρνεα, ἐπειδὰν ἴδωσι γλαῦκα· 14 ἐφ' ᾧ καὶ ξυνετίθει λόγον Αἴσωπος τοιοῦτον, ὡς τὰ ὄρνεα ξυνῆλθε πρὸς τὴν γλαῦκα καὶ ἐδεῖτο τῆς μὲν ἀπὸ τῶν οἰκοδομημάτων σκέπης ἀπανίστασθαι, πρὸς δὲ τὰ δένδρα τὴν καλιάν, ὥσπερ καὶ αὐτά, καὶ τοὺς τούτων μεταπήγνυσθαι κλῶνας, ἀφ' ὧν καὶ ᾄδειν ἔστιν εὐσημότερον· καὶ δὴ καὶ πρὸς δρῦν ταυτηνὶ ἄρτι φυομένην, ἐπειδὰν πρὸς ὥραν ἀφίκηται, ἑτοίμως ἔχειν ἱζάνειν καὶ τῆς χλοερᾶς κόμης ἀπόνασθαι. ἀλλ' οὖν τήν γε γλαῦκα μὴ τοῦτο τοῖς ὀρνέοις ποιεῖν παραινεῖν μηδὲ φυτοῦ βλάστῃ ἐφήδεσθαι "ἰξὸν πεφυκότος φέρειν, πτηνοῖς ὄλεθρον". 15 τὰ δὲ μήτε τῆς ξυμβουλῆς ἀπεδέχετο τὴν γλαῦκα, τοὐναντίον δὲ ἔχαιρε τῇ δρυῒ φυομένῃ, ἐπειδή τε ἱκανὴ ἦν, καθίσαντα ἐπ' αὐτὴν ᾖδεν. γενομένου δὲ τοῦ ἰξοῦ ῥᾳδίως ἤδη ὑπὸ τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἁλισκόμενα μετενόουν καὶ τὴν γλαῦκα ἐθαύμαζον ἐπὶ τῇ ξυμβουλῇ. καὶ νῦν ἔτι οὕτως ἔχουσιν, ὡς δεινῆς καὶ σοφῆς οὔσης αὐτῆς, καὶ διὰ τοῦτο ἐθέλουσι πλησιάζειν, ἡγούμενα ἀγα-

θόν τι ἀπολαύειν τῆς ξυνουσίας· ἔπειτα οἶμαι προσίασι μάτην ἐπὶ
κακῷ. ἡ μὲν γὰρ ἀρχαία γλαῦξ τῷ ὄντι φρονίμη τε ἦν καὶ ξυμβου-
λεύειν ἐδύνατο. αἱ δὲ νῦν μόνον τὰ πτερὰ ἔχουσιν ἐκείνης καὶ τοὺς
ὀφθαλμοὺς καὶ τὸ ῥάμφος, τὰ δὲ ἄλλα ἀφρονέστεραί εἰσι τῶν
ἄλλων ὀρνέων. οὐκοῦν οὐδὲ ἑαυτὰς δύνανται οὐδὲν ὠφελεῖν· 16
οὐ γὰρ ἂν παρὰ τοῖς ὀρνιθοθήραις ἐτρέφοντο δεδεμέναι καὶ δου-
λεύουσαι.

G24a Plu. *Mor.* 14E

ὅτι δὲ τῶν ἐν φιλοσοφίᾳ λεγομένων οἱ σφόδρα νέοι τοῖς μὴ δοκοῦσι φιλοσόφως μηδ' ἀπὸ σπουδῆς λέγεσθαι χαίρουσι μᾶλλον καὶ παρέχουσιν ὑπηκόους ἑαυτοὺς καὶ χειροήθεις, δῆλόν ἐστιν ἡμῖν. οὐ γὰρ μόνον τὰ Αἰσώπεια μυθάρια καὶ τὰς ποιητικὰς ὑποθέσεις ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸν Ἄβαριν τὸν Ἡρακλείδου καὶ τὸν Λύκωνα τὸν Ἀρίστωνος μεθ' ἡδονῆς ἐνθουσιῶσι.

G24b Plu. *Mor.* 16C

[vide Socr. 46T2]

G25a Plu. *Mor.* 152D

[Σόλων:] σὺ [*sc.* Αἴσωπος] δὲ δεινὸς εἶ κοράκων ἐπαΐειν καὶ κολοιῶν...

G25b Plu. *Mor.* 158B

[vide Hes. 2T5]

G25c Plu. *Mor.* 162BC

Ὁ δ' Αἴσωπος "ἀλλ' ὑμεῖς," ἔφη, "τοὺς ἐμοὺς χλευάζετε κολοιοὺς καὶ κόρακας εἰ διαλέγονται· δελφῖνες δὲ τοιαῦτα [*de Arione*] νεανιεύονται;" Κἀγὼ πρὸς αὐτόν, "ἄλλο τι λέγωμεν," ἔφην, [C] "ὦ Αἴσωπε· τούτῳ δὲ τῷ λόγῳ πιστευομένῳ καὶ γραφομένῳ παρ' ἡμῖν πλέον ἢ χίλι' ἔτη διαγέγονεν καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν Ἰνοῦς καὶ Ἀθάμαντος χρόνων."

G25d Plu. *Mor.* 164B

...ὁ Χερσίας μειδιάσας "ἀλλ' οὐκ ἄν," ἔφη, "φράσαιμι πρότερον ἢ πυθέσθαι παρὰ τούτων ὅ τι βούλεται τὸ 'μηδὲν ἄγαν' αὐτοῖς καὶ τὸ 'γνῶθι σαυτόν,' καὶ τοῦτο δὴ τὸ πολλοὺς μὲν ἀγάμους πολλοὺς δ' ἀπίστους ἐνίους δὲ καὶ ἀφώνους πεποιηκὸς 'ἐγγύα πάρα δ' ἄτα.'" "Τί δ'," εἶπεν ὁ Πιττακός, "ἡμῶν δέῃ ταῦτα φραζόντων; πάλαι γὰρ

Αἰσώπου λόγον εἰς ἕκαστον ὡς ἔοικε τούτων συντεθεικότος ἐπαινεῖς." Καὶ ὁ Αἴσωπος, "ὅταν γε παίζῃ πρὸς ἐμὲ Χερσίας," εἶπε· "σπουδάζων δὲ τούτων Ὅμηρον εὑρετὴν ἀποδείκνυσι..."

G26 Plu. *Mor.* 871D

οὐκέτι Σκύθαις οὐδὲ Πέρσαις οὐδ' Αἰγυπτίοις τοὺς ἑαυτοῦ λόγους ἀνατίθησι πλάττων [sc. Ἡρόδοτος], ὥσπερ Αἴσωπος κόραξι καὶ πιθήκοις, ἀλλά...

G27 Herennius Ph. fr. 32 Palmieri

[praecedit Lucill. Tarrh. G22]

καὶ οὕτω μὲν καὶ τοῦτο κατεστρωμένον οὕτω ῥητῶς ἐν τοῖς Ἐρεννίου Φίλωνος.

G28 (Ps.-)Diogenian. *Praef.*

Ἔστι δὲ ἡ παροιμία τρόπος καὶ τῆς καλουμένης ἀλληγορίας· παράκειται δὲ αὐτῇ λόγος αἶνος Αἰσώπειος, Καρικὸς αἶνος, Συβαριτικὸς λόγος, Κύπριος, Λιβυκὸς αἶνος, Μαισωνικὴ παροιμία· μάρσιπος. Αἶνος μὲν οὖν ἐστὶ κατ' ἀνάπλασιν μυθικὴν ἀναφερόμενος ἀπὸ ἀλόγων ζώων ἢ φυτῶν ἐπὶ ἀνθρώπων παραίνεσιν. Καὶ ἀπὸ ζώων μέν, ὡς...

[sequitur Archil. 4T10].

ἀπὸ δὲ φυτῶν, ...

[sequuntur Call. 20T5 Hom. 1T2].

Οἱ δ' ἄλλοι τῶν κατειλεγμένων ὀνόματι μὲν διαφέρειν, δυνάμει δ' εἰσὶν ἐμφερεῖς. Αἰσώπειος μὲν γὰρ λέγεται ὁ ἀπὸ ἀνδρὸς Αἰσώπου πλεονάσαντος ἐν τῷ τοιούτῳ εἴδει τοῦ μύθου, οὐχ εὑρόντος, ὡς ἐν ποιητικῇ μέτρον Ἀρχεβούλειον ἢ καὶ Ἀριστοφάνειον, ἃ λέγεται οὐχ εὑρημένα ὑπὸ τῶν ἀνδρῶν, ἀλλὰ παρὰ τούτοις κατακορέστερον ἐν τῇ ποιήσει τεταγμένα. Καρικὸς δὲ αἶνος λέγεται, ὃν ἀναφέρουσιν εἰς γένει Κᾶρα ἄνδρα·

[sequuntur Timocr. 10T2 Simon. 9T1].

Ὁ Συβαριτικὸς δὲ λέγεται εἶναι τοιοῦτος ὁποῖον...

[sequitur Ar. 17T8].

Ὁ δὲ Κύπριος προσηγόρευται διὰ τὸ παρὰ Κυπρίοις λέγεσθαι ὡς ἐπιχώριος.

[sequitur Timocr. 10T3].

Λιβυκὸς δὲ αἶνος ἀπὸ τοῦ ἔθνους εἰρῆσθαι λέγεται, ἀπὸ Λιβυός τινος· οἱ δὲ Κύβισαν εὑρέτην γενέσθαι τοῦ εἴδους τούτου, ὡς...

[sequitur A. 12T6].

G29 Theo Sm. (p. 73 Hiller)

λόγος δὲ κατὰ μὲν τοὺς περιπατητικοὺς λέγεται πολλαχῶς, ὅ τε μετὰ φωνῆς προφορικὸς ὑπὸ τῶν νεωτέρων λεγόμενος καὶ ὁ ἐνδιάθετος καὶ ὁ ἐν διανοίᾳ κείμενος ἄνευ φθόγγου καὶ φωνῆς καὶ ὁ τῆς ἀναλογίας, καθ' ὃν λέγεται ἔχειν λόγον τόδε πρὸς τόδε, καὶ ἡ τῶν τοῦ λόγου στοιχείων ἀπόδοσις καὶ ὁ τῶν τιμώντων καὶ τιμωμένων, καθ' ὅν φαμεν λόγον τινὸς ἔχειν ἢ μὴ ἔχειν, καὶ ὁ τραπεζιτικὸς λόγος καὶ ὁ ἐν τῷ βιβλίῳ Δημοσθενικὸς ἢ Λυσιακὸς καὶ ὁ ὅρος ὁ τὸ τί ἦν εἶναι καὶ τὴν οὐσίαν σημαίνων, ὁριστικὸς ὤν, καὶ ὁ συλλογισμὸς δὲ καὶ ἡ ἐπαγωγὴ

καὶ ὁ Λιβυκὸς καὶ ὁ μῦθος καὶ ὁ αἶνος λόγος λέγεται καὶ ἡ παροιμία,

ἔτι δὲ καὶ ὁ τοῦ εἴδους καὶ ὁ σπερματικὸς καὶ ἄλλοι πλείονες.

G30 Suet. *Rhet.* 1

Sed ratio docendi nec una omnibus nec singulis eadem semper fuit, quando vario modo quisque discipulos exercuerunt. nam et dicta praeclare per omnes figuras <versare>

et apologos aliter atque aliter exponere

et narrationes cum breuiter ac presse tum latius et uberius explicare consuerant, interdum Graecorum scripta convertere ac viros illustres laudare vel vituperare, quedam etiam ad usum communis vitae instituta tum utilia et necessaria tum perniciosa et supervacanea ostendere, saepe fabulis fidem firmare aut demere, quod genus θέσεις *et* ἀνασκευάς *et* κατασκευάς *Graeci vocant: donec sensim haec exoluerunt et ad controversiam ventum est.*

G31 Gell. 2.29.1

Apologus Aesopi Phrygis memoratu non inutilis

1 *Aesopus ille e Phrygia fabulator haut inmerito sapiens existimatus est, cum, quae utilia monitu suasuque erant, non seuere neque imperiose praecepit et censuit, ut philosophis mos est, sed festiuos delectabilesque apologos commentus res salubriter ac prospicienter animaduersas in mentes animosque hominum cum audiendi quadam inlecebra induit.*

2 *Velut haec eius fabula de auiculae nidulo lepide atque iucunde promonet spem fiduciamque rerum, quas efficere quis possit, haut umquam in alio, sed in semetipso habendam.*

3 *'Auicula' inquit 'est parua, nomen est cassita.* 4 *Habitat nidulaturque in segetibus id ferme temporis, ut appetat messis pullis iam iam plumantibus.* 5 *Ea cassita in sementes forte congesserat tempestiuiores; propterea frumentis flauescentibus pulli etiam tunc inuolucres erant.* 6 *Dum igitur ipsa iret cibum pullis quaesitum, monet eos, ut, si quid ibi rei nouae fieret diceretur ue, animaduerterent idque uti sibi, ubi redisset, nuntiarent.* 7 *Dominus postea segetum illarum filium adulescentem uocat et "uidesne" inquit "haec ematuruisse et manus iam postulare? idcirco die crastini, ubi primum diluculabit, fac amicos eas et roges, ueniant operamque mutuam dent et messim hanc nobis adiuuent."* 8 *Haec ubi ille dixit, et*

discessit. 8 *Atque ubi redit cassita, pulli tremibundi, trepiduli circumstrepere orareque matrem, ut iam statim properet inque alium locum sese asportet: "nam dominus" inquiunt "misit, qui amicos roget, uti luce oriente veniant et metant." Mater iubet eos otioso animo esse: "si enim dominus" inquit "messim ad amicos reicit, crastino seges non metetur neque necessum est, hodie uti uos auferam."* 10 *Die' inquit 'postero mater in pabulum uolat. Dominus, quos rogauerat, opperitur. Sol feruit, et fit nihil; it dies, et amici nulli eunt.* 11 *Tum ille rursum ad filium: "amici isti magnam partem" inquit "cessatores sunt. Quin potius imus et cognatos adfinesque nostros oramus, ut assint cras tempori ad metendum?" Itidem hoc pulli pauefacti matri nuntiant.* 12 *Mater hortatur, ut tum quoque sine metu ac sine cura sint; cognatos adfinesque nullos ferme tam esse obsequibiles ait, ut ad laborem capessendum nihil cunctentur et statim dicto oboediant: "uos modo" inquit "aduertite, si modo quid denuo dicetur."* 13 *Cognati et adfines operam, quam dare rogati sunt, supersederunt.* 14 *Ad postremum igitur dominus filio: "ualeant" inquit "amici cum propinquis. Afferes primo luci falces duas; unam egomet mihi et tu tibi capies alteram, et frumentum nosmetipsi manibus nostris cras metemus."* 15 *Id ubi ex pullis dixisse dominum mater audiuit: "tempus" inquit "est cedendi et abeundi; fiet nunc dubio procul, quod futurum dixit. In ipso enim iam uertitur, cuia res est, non in alio, unde petitur." Atque ita cassita nidum migrauit, seges a domino demessa est.'*

17 *Haec quidem est Aesopi fabula de amicorum et propinquorum leui plerumque et inani fiducia.* 18 *Sed quid aliud sanctiores libri philosophorum monent, quam ut in nobis tantum ipsis nitamur,* 19 *alia autem omnia, quae extra nos extraque nostrum animum sunt, neque pro nostris neque pro nobis ducamus?* 20 *Hunc Aesopi apologum Q. Ennius in* satiris [II 21-58, pp. 207-209 Vahlen] *scite admodum et uenuste uersibus quadratis composuit. Quorum duo postremi isti sunt, quos habere cordi et memoriae operae pretium esse hercle puto:*

hoc erit tibi argumentum semper in promptu situm:
ne quid expectes amicos, quod tute agere possies.

G32 Luc. *VH* 2.18

παρῆν δὲ καὶ Αἴσωπος ὁ Φρύξ· τούτῳ δὲ ὅσα καὶ γελωτοποιῷ χρῶνται.

G33 Max. Tyr. 19.2

Φράσω δὲ αὐτὴν κατὰ τοὺς τοῦ Φρυγὸς λόγους μῦθον πλάττων.

Ποιμὴν ἀνὴρ καὶ μάγειρος ἐβάδιζον ἄμφω κοινὴν ὁδόν· ἰδόντες δὲ ἐκ ποίμνης ἄρνα εὐτραφῆ πλανώμενον, ἀπολειφθέντα τῶν συννόμων, ὤσαντο ἐπ' αὐτὸν ἄμφω· ἦν ἄρα τότε ὁμόφωνα καὶ τὰ θηρία τοῖς ἀνθρώποις· ἐρωτᾷ ὁ ἀμνός, τίς ὡς ἑκάτερος ἐθέλει αὐτὸν

μεταχειρίσασθαι καὶ ἄγειν. Ὡς δὲ ἐπύθετο τἀληθῆ αὐτά, τὴν ἀμφοῖν τέχνην, φέρων ἑαυτὸν ἐπιτρέπει τῷ ποιμένι· "σὺ μὲν γὰρ δήμιός τις εἶ καὶ μιαιφόνος τῆς ἀρνῶν ποίμνης, τούτῳ δὲ ἐξαρκέσει, ἂν καλῶς τὰ ἡμέτερα ἔλθῃ."

Εἴκαζε, εἰ βούλει, κατὰ τὸν μῦθον, τοὺς μὲν ἐραστὰς ἐκείνους μαγείροις πολλοῖς, τὸν δὲ Σωκράτην ποιμένι ἑνί, τὰ δὲ μειράκια τὰ Ἀττικὰ θρέμμασιν πλανωμένοις, ὁμοφώνοις ἀληθῶς, οὐ κατὰ τὴν ἐν τοῖς μύθοις ἐξουσίαν.

G34 Max. Tyr. 32.1

Αἰσώπῳ τῷ Φρυγὶ πεποίηνται διάλογοί τε θηρίων καὶ ξυνουσίαι, διαλέγεται δὲ αὐτῷ καὶ τὰ δένδρα καὶ οἱ ἰχθύες, ἄλλο ἄλλῳ καὶ ἀνθρώπων ἀναμίξ· καταμέμικται δὲ ἐν τοῖς λόγοις τούτοις νοῦς βραχὺς αἰνιττόμενός τι τῶν ἀληθῶν.

[sequitur Epicur. 54T1]

... - σοφὴ γάρ τις αὕτη [ἡ ἀλώπηξ] τῷ Αἰσώπῳ ἐστίν - ...

[pergit 54T1]

G35 Max. Tyr. 36

Βούλομαί σοι κατὰ τὴν τοῦ Λυδοῦ σοφίαν ποιῆσαι μῦθον· διαλέξονται δέ μοι ἐν τῷ μύθῳ οὐχ ὁ λέων, οὐδὲ ὁ ἀετός, οὐδὲ τὰ τούτων ἔτι ἀφωνότερα, αἱ δρύες, ἀλλ' ὡδί μοι λελέξεται·

Ζεὺς ἦν καὶ οὐρανὸς καὶ γῆ· οὐρανῷ μὲν πολῖται θεοί· τὰ δὲ γῆς θρέμματα, οἱ ἄνθρωποι, οὔπω ποτὲ ἐν φωτὶ ἦσαν. Καλεῖ δὴ Ζεὺς Προμηθέα, καὶ αὐτῷ προστάττει κατανεῖμαι τῇ γῇ ἀποικίαν, ζῷον ἁπλοῦν, "κατὰ μὲν τὴν γνώμην ἐγγύτατα ἡμῖν τοῖς θεοῖς, τὸ δὲ σῶμα αὐτῶν ἔστω λεπτόν, καὶ ὄρθιον, καὶ σύμμετρον, καὶ ἰδεῖν ἥμερον, καὶ χειρουργεῖν εὔκολον, καὶ βαδίζειν ἀσφαλές." Πείθεται ὁ Προμηθεὺς Διί, καὶ ποιεῖ ἀνθρώπους, καὶ οἰκίζει τὴν γῆν. Οἱ δὲ ἐπεὶ γενέσεως ἐπελάβοντο, οὐ χαλεπῶς διέζων· καὶ γὰρ τροφὴν αὐτοῖς ἀποχρῶσαν γῆ παρείχετο, λειμῶνας δασεῖς, καὶ ὄρη κομῶντα καὶ καρπῶν χορηγίαν, ὅσα γῆ φέρειν φιλεῖ μηδὲν ὑπὸ γεωργῶν ἐνοχλουμένη· παρείχοντο δὲ καὶ αἱ νύμφαι κρήνας καθαρὰς καὶ ποταμοὺς διειδεῖς, καὶ ἄλλων ναμάτων εὐπόρους τε καὶ δαψιλεῖς πηγάς· πρὸς δὲ καὶ θάλπος μὲν ἐξ ἡλίου τοῖς σώμασιν περιχεόμενον συμμέτρως αὐτὰ παρεμυθεῖτο, αὖραι δὲ ἐκ ποταμῶν ὥρᾳ θέρους ἐπιπνέουσαι ἀνέψυχον αὐτοῖς τὰ σώματα· περιμάχητον δ' ἦν τούτων οὐδὲν ἐν ἀφθόνῳ τῇ τῶν αὐτομάτων χορηγίᾳ διαιτωμένοις.

G36 Σ *in Il.* 19.407

αὐδήεντα: εἰ θείας μετέχουσι φύσεως, τί ἄτοπον καὶ φωνεῖν; πρῶτος δὲ Ὅμηρος τοῦτο ἐποίησεν,...

[sequuntur Hes. 2T18 Archil. 4T26]

...καὶ Αἴσωπος ὕστερον κατεχρήσατο.

G37 (Ps.-?)Ptol. Ascal. *s.v.* αἶνος καὶ παροιμία (p. 394 Heylbut)

αἶνος καὶ παροιμία διαφέρει· ὁ μὲν γὰρ αἶνός ἐστιν λόγος κατ' ἀναπόλησιν μυθικὴν ἀναφερόμενος ἀπὸ ἀλόγων ζῴων ἢ φυτῶν πρὸς ἀνθρώπων παραίνεσιν καί ἐστιν ἐξηπλωμένη παροιμία μετὰ διηγήσεως ἀπαρτίζουσα τὸ νοούμενον· παροιμία δὲ † τὰ ἀπὸ κεφαλαίου ἐπὶ τὸ χεῖρον ἀναφορὰν ἐνδέουσα τοῦ αἴνου καί τι ἔξωθεν δεχομένη.

G38 Tat. *Orat.* 34

καὶ τὸν ψευδολόγον Αἴσωπον ἀείμνηστον οὐ μόνον τὰ μυθολογήματα, καὶ ἡ κατὰ τὸν Ἀριστόδημον δὲ πλαστικὴ περισπούδαστον ἀπέδειξεν.

G39 anon. *Περὶ αἴνου* (p. 154 Bartoletti)

1 [****]*[
[***]***[
3 [***]**[
[sequuntur Ar. 17T10, 17F4]
13 ὁ δὲ Κύπρι[ο]ς λεγό[μενος]
αἶνος ὄνομ̣α τ̣ο̣ιο[ῦτον]
15 ἤνεγκεν ὡς ε̣φ̣η̣[____ διὰ τὸ]
παρὰ Κυπρίοις ἐ̣π̣[ιχώρι-]
[ο]ς λέγεσθαι.
[sequitur Timocr. 10T4, 10F1]

G40a *Vit. Aesop.* 1GW

G Ὁ πάντα βιωφελέστατος Αἴσωπος, ὁ λογοποιός, τῇ μὲν τύχῃ ἦν δοῦλος, τῷ δὲ γένει Φρὺξ ⟨ἐξ Ἀμορίου⟩ τῆς Φρυγίας· κακοπινὴς τὸ ἰδέσθαι εἰς ὑπερβολήν, σαπρός, προγάστωρ, προκέφαλος, σιμός, λορδός, μέλας, κολοβός, βλαισός, γαλιάγκων, στρεβλός, μυστάκων, ἡμερινὸν ἁμάρτημα. καὶ πρὸς τούτοις ἐλάττωμα μεῖζον εἶχε τῆς ἀμορφίας τὴν ἀφωνίαν· ἦν δὲ καὶ νωδὸς καὶ οὐδὲν ἠδύνατο λαλεῖν.

W 'Ο κατὰ πάντα τὸν βίον γενόμενος βιωφελέστατος Αἴσωπος, ὁ λογομυθοποιός, τῇ μὲν τύχῃ γέγονε δοῦλος τῷ δὲ γένει Φρὺξ ἐξ Ἀμορίου τῆς Φρυγίας, κακοειδὴς εἰς ὑπερβολήν, προκέφαλος, κοντοδείρης, σιμός, μέλας, μυστάκων, προγάστωρ, γαλιάγκων, στρεβλός, ὑπόκυρτος, ἡμερινὸν ἀμάρτημα. πρὸς τούτοις δέ, ἦν καὶ βραδύγλωσσος καὶ βομβόφωνος φαῦλός τε καὶ δεινὸς πανουργίᾳ.

G40b ***Vit. Aesop.*** **7GW**

G ἐνταῦθα δὲ ἡ θεός, ἡ κυρία Ἶσις, παραγίνεται ἅμα ταῖς ἐννέα Μούσαις, εἶτα ἔφη "ὁρᾶτε, θυγατέρες, εὐσεβείας κατακάλυμμα, τὸν ἄνθρωπον τοῦτον, πεπλασμένον μὲν ἀμόρφως, νικῶντα δὲ εἰς ε(ἴσω εὐ)μορφίαν πάντα ψόγον· οὗτός ποτε τὴν ἐμὴν διάκονον πεπλανημένην ὡδήγησεν· πάρειμι δὲ σὺν ὑμῖν ἀνταμείψασθαι τὸν ἄνθρωπον. ἐγὼ μὲν οὖν τὴν φωνὴν ἀποκαθίστημι, ὑμεῖς δὲ τῇ φωνῇ τὸν ἄριστον χαρίσασθε λόγον." εἰποῦσα δὲ ταῦτα καὶ τὸ τραχὺ τῆς γλώττης ἀποτεμοῦσα, τὸ κωλῦον αὐτὸν λαλεῖν, αὐτὴ δὴ ἡ Ἶσις ἐχαρίσατο ⟨τὴν φωνήν⟩ [τὸν λόγον καὶ Ἕλληνα λόγων μυθικῶν εὑρέσεις], ἔπεισεν δὲ καὶ τὰς λοιπὰς Μούσας ἑκάστη⟨ν⟩ τι τῆς ἰδίας δωρεὰν χαρίσασθαι. αἱ δὲ ἐχαρίσαντο λόγων εὕρεμα καὶ μύθων Ἑλληνικῶν πλοκὴν καὶ ποιήσεις. κατευξαμένη δὲ ἡ θεὸς ὅπως ἔνδοξος γένηται, εἰς ἑαυτὴν ἐχώρησεν. καὶ αἱ Μοῦσαι δέ, ἑκάστη τὸ ἴδιον χαρισάμεναι, εἰς τὸν Ἑλικῶνα ἀνέβησαν ὄρος.

W ἡ δὲ Τύχη ἐπιστᾶσα καθ' ὕπνους ἐχαρίσατο αὐτῷ ἄριστον λόγον καὶ τὸ ταχὺ τῆς γλώττης καὶ ἑτοιμολογίας εὕρεσιν διὰ ποικίλων μύθων, ὡς φιλοθεῷ ὄντι καὶ φιλοξένῳ.

G40c ***Vit. Aesop.*** **100GW**

G Αἴσωπος οὖν αὐτῷ [*sc.* τῷ Κροίσῳ] συγγραψάμενος τοὺς ἰδίους λόγους καὶ μύθους, τοὺς ἄχρι καὶ νῦν ἀναγινωσκομένους, κατέλιπεν εἰς τὴν βιβλιοθήκην...

W συγγράψας οὖν τοὺς ἰδίους μύθους τοὺς μέχρι νῦν ἀναγινωσκομένους κατέλιπε τῷ βασιλεῖ.

G41 Hermog. ***Prog.*** **1** (*et ap.* Niceph. Basil. *Prog.* 1.2)

Περὶ μύθου

Τὸν μῦθον πρῶτον ἀξιοῦσι προσάγειν τοῖς νέοις, διότι τὰς ψυχὰς αὐτῶν πρὸς τὸ βέλτιον ῥυθμίζειν δύναται· ἔτι οὖν αὐτοὺς ἁπαλοὺς ὄντας ἀξιοῦσι πλάττειν.

Φαίνονται δὲ τούτῳ χρησάμενοι καὶ οἱ ἀρχαῖοι,...

[sequuntur Hes. 2T9 Archil. 4T15]

Ὀνομάζονται δὲ ἀπὸ τῶν εὑρόντων οἳ μὲν Κύπριοι, οἳ δὲ Λιβυκοί, οἳ δὲ Συβαριτικοί· πάντες δὲ κοινῶς Αἰσώπειοι λέγονται, διότι τοῖς μύθοις Αἴσωπος ἐχρῆτο πρὸς τὰς συνουσίας.

Ὑπογραφὴν δέ τινα τοιαύτην ἀποδιδόασιν αὐτοῦ· ψευδῆ μὲν αὐτὸν ἀξιοῦσιν εἶναι, πάντως δὲ χρήσιμον πρός τι τῶν ἐν τῷ βίῳ· ἔτι δὲ καὶ πιθανὸν εἶναι βούλονται. πῶς δ' ἂν γένοιτο πιθανός; ἂν τὰ προσήκοντα πράγματα τοῖς προσώποις ἀποδιδῶμεν. οἷον περὶ κάλλους τις ἀγωνίζεται· ταὼς οὗτος ὑποκείσθω. δεῖ τινι σοφόν τι περιτεθῆναι· ἀλώπηξ ἐνταῦθα. μιμούμενοι τὰ τῶν ἀνθρώπων πράγματα· ἐνταῦθα οἱ πίθηκοι.

Χρὴ δὲ αὐτοὺς ποτὲ μὲν ἐκτείνειν, ποτὲ δὲ συστέλλειν. πῶς δ' ἂν τοῦτο γένοιτο; εἰ νῦν μὲν αὐτὸν ψιλὸν λέγοιμεν κατὰ ἀφήγησιν, νῦν δὲ λόγους πλάττοιμεν τῶν δεδομένων προσώπων· οἷον, ἵνα σοι καὶ ἐπὶ παραδείγματος γένηται φανερόν,

"οἱ πίθηκοι συνελθόντες ἐβουλεύοντο περὶ τοῦ χρῆναι πόλιν οἰκίζειν· καὶ ἐπειδὴ ἔδοξεν αὐτοῖς, ἤμελλον ἅπτεσθαι τοῦ ἔργου. γέρων οὖν πίθηκος ἐπέσχεν αὐτοὺς εἰπών, ὅτι ῥᾷον ἁλώσονται περιβόλων ἐντὸς ἀποληφθέντες."

οὕτως ἂν συντέμοις. εἰ δὲ ἐκτείνειν βούλοιο, ταύτῃ πρόαγε·

"οἱ πίθηκοι συνελθόντες ἐβουλεύοντο περὶ πόλεως οἰκισμοῦ. καὶ δή τις παρελθὼν ἐδημηγόρησεν, ὅτι χρὴ καὶ αὐτοὺς πόλιν ἔχειν· ὁρᾶτε γάρ, φησίν, ὡς εὐδαίμονες διὰ τοῦτο οἱ ἄνθρωποι· καὶ οἶκον ἔχει ἕκαστος αὐτῶν καὶ εἰς ἐκκλησίαν οἱ σύμπαντες καὶ εἰς θέατρον ἀναβαίνοντες τέρπουσι τὰς ψυχὰς αὐτῶν θεάμασί τε καὶ ἀκούσμασι παντοδαποῖς",

καὶ οὕτω πρόαγε διατρίβων καὶ λέγων, ὅτι καὶ τὸ ψήφισμα ἐγέγραπτο, καὶ λόγον πλάττε καὶ παρὰ τοῦ γέροντος πιθήκου. Καὶ ταῦτα μὲν ταύτῃ.

Τὴν δὲ ἀπαγγελίαν βούλονται περιόδων ἀλλοτρίαν εἶναι γλυκύτητος ἐγγύς.

Ὁ δὲ λόγος ὁ τὴν ὠφέλειαν δεικνὺς τὴν ἀπὸ τοῦ μύθου ποτὲ μὲν προταχθήσεται, ποτὲ δὲ ὑποταχθήσεται.

Φαίνονται δὲ καὶ οἱ ῥήτορες αὐτῷ χρησάμενοι ἀντὶ παραδείγματος.

G42 Philostr. (II) *VA* 5.14-16

5.14 ἄρξαι δ' αὐτῶν τὸν Ἀπολλώνιον ὧδε ἐρόμενον τοὺς ἑταίρους "ἔστι τι μυθολογία;" "νὴ Δί'", εἶπεν ὁ Μένιππος "ἥν γε οἱ ποιηταὶ

ἐπαινοῦσι." "τὸν δὲ δὴ Αἴσωπον τί ἡγῇ;" "μυθολόγον" εἶπε "καὶ λογοποιὸν πάντα." "πότεροι δὲ σοφοὶ τῶν μύθων;" "οἱ τῶν ποιητῶν", εἶπεν "ἐπειδὴ ὡς γεγονότες ᾄδονται." "οἱ δὲ δὴ Αἰσώπου τί;" "βάτραχοι" ἔφη "καὶ ὄνοι καὶ λῆροι γραυσὶν οἷοι μασᾶσθαι καὶ παιδίοις." "καὶ μὴν" ἔφη "ἐμοὶ" ὁ Ἀπολλώνιος, "ἐπιτηδειότεροι πρὸς σοφίαν οἱ τοῦ Αἰσώπου φαίνονται· οἱ μὲν γὰρ περὶ τοὺς ἥρωας, ὧν ποιητικὴ πᾶσα ἔχεται, καὶ διαφθείρουσι τοὺς ἀκροωμένους, ἐπειδὴ ἔρωτάς τε ἀτόπους οἱ ποιηταὶ ἑρμηνεύουσι καὶ ἀδελφῶν γάμους καὶ διαβολὰς ἐς θεοὺς καὶ βρώσεις παίδων καὶ πανουργίας ἀνελευθέρους καὶ δίκας, καὶ τὸ ὡς γεγονὸς αὐτῶν ἄγει καὶ τὸν ἐρῶντα καὶ τὸν ζηλοτυποῦντα καὶ τὸν ἐπιθυμοῦντα πλουτεῖν ἢ τυραννεύειν ἐφ' ἅπερ οἱ μῦθοι, Αἴσωπος δὲ ὑπὸ σοφίας πρῶτον μὲν οὐκ ἐς τὸ κοινὸν τῶν ταῦτα ᾀδόντων ἑαυτὸν κατέστησεν, ἀλλ' ἑαυτοῦ τινα ὁδὸν ἐτράπετο, εἶτα, ὥσπερ οἱ τοῖς εὐτελεστέροις βρώμασι καλῶς ἑστιῶντες, ἀπὸ σμικρῶν πραγμάτων διδάσκει μεγάλα, καὶ προθέμενος τὸν λόγον ἐπάγει αὐτῷ τὸ πρᾶττε ἢ μὴ πρᾶττε, εἶτα τοῦ φιλαλήθους μᾶλλον ἢ οἱ ποιηταὶ ἥψατο· οἱ μὲν γὰρ βιάζονται πιθανοὺς φαίνεσθαι τοὺς ἑαυτῶν λόγους, ὁ δ' ἐπαγγέλλων λόγον, ὅς ἐστι ψευδής, πᾶς οἶδεν, ὅτι αὐτὸ τὸ μὴ περὶ ἀληθινῶν ἐρεῖν ἀληθεύει. καὶ ὁ μὲν ποιητὴς εἰπὼν τὸν ἑαυτοῦ λόγον καταλείπει τῷ ὑγιαίνοντι ἀκροατῇ βασανίζειν αὐτόν, εἰ ἐγένετο, ὁ δὲ εἰπὼν μὲν ψευδῆ λόγον, ἐπαγαγὼν δὲ νουθεσίαν, ὥσπερ ὁ Αἴσωπος, δείκνυσιν ὡς ἐς τὸ χρήσιμον τῆς ἀκροάσεως τῷ ψεύδει κέχρηται. χαρίεν δ' αὐτοῦ τὸ καὶ ἄλογα ἡδίω ἐργάζεσθαι καὶ σπουδῆς ἄξια τοῖς ἀνθρώποις, ἐκ παίδων γὰρ τοῖς λόγοις τούτοις ξυγγενόμενοι καὶ ὑπ' αὐτῶν ἐκνηπιωθέντες δόξας ἀναλαμβάνομεν περὶ ἑκάστου τῶν ζῴων, τὰ μὲν ὡς βασιλικὰ εἴη, τὰ δὲ ὡς εὐήθη, τὰ δὲ ὡς κομψά, τὰ δὲ ὡς ἀκέραια, καὶ ὁ μὲν ποιητὴς εἰπὼν

πολλαὶ μορφαὶ τῶν δαιμονίων [E. *Alc.* 1159]

ἢ τοιοῦτό τι ἐπιχορεύσας ἀπῆλθεν, ὁ δὲ Αἴσωπος ἐπιχρησμῳδήσας τὸν ἑαυτοῦ λόγον καταλύει τὴν ξυνουσίαν ἐς ὃ προὔθετο. 5.15 ἐμὲ δέ, ὦ Μένιππε, καὶ μῦθον περὶ τῆς Αἰσώπου σοφίας ἐδιδάξατο ἡ μήτηρ κομιδῇ νήπιον, ὡς

εἴη μέν ποτε ποιμὴν ὁ Αἴσωπος, νέμοι δὲ πρὸς ἱερῷ Ἑρμοῦ, σοφίας δὲ ἐρῴη καὶ εὔχοιτο αὐτῷ ὑπὲρ τούτου, πολλοὶ δὲ καὶ ἕτεροι ταὐτὸν αἰτοῦντες ἐπιφοιτῷεν τῷ Ἑρμῇ ὁ μὲν χρυσόν, ὁ δ' ἄργυρον, ὁ δὲ κηρύκειον ἐλεφάντινον, ὁ δὲ τῶν οὕτω τι λαμπρῶν ἀνάπτων, ὁ δ' Αἴσωπος ἔχοι μὲν οὕτως, ὡς μηδὲν τῶν τοιούτων ἔχειν, φείδοιτο δὲ καὶ ὧν εἶχε, γάλακτος δὲ αὐτῷ σπένδοι, ὅσον ὄις ἀμελχθεῖσα ἐδίδου καὶ κηρίον ἐπὶ τὸν βωμὸν φέροι, ὅσον τὴν χεῖρα ἐμπλῆσαι,

ἐστιᾶν δ' αὐτὸν καὶ μύρτοις ᾤετο καὶ παραθεὶς ἂν τῶν ῥόδων ἢ τῶν ἴων κομιδῇ ὀλίγα. "τί γὰρ δεῖ, ὦ Ἑρμῆ", ἔλεγε "στεφάνους πλέκειν καὶ ἀμελεῖν τῶν προβάτων;" ὡς δὲ ἀφίκοντο ἐς ῥητὴν ἡμέραν ἐπὶ τῆς σοφίας διανομήν, ὁ μὲν Ἑρμῆς ἅτε λόγιος καὶ κερδῷος "σὺ μὲν" ἔφη "φιλοσοφίαν ἔχε", τῷ πλεῖστα δήπουθεν ἀναθέντι "σὺ δὲ ἐς ῥητόρων ἤθη χώρει", τῷ δεύτερά που χαρισαμένῳ, "σοὶ δὲ ἀστρονομεῖν χώρα, σοὶ δὲ εἶναι μουσικῷ, σοὶ δὲ ἡρῴου ποιητῇ μέτρου, σοὶ δὲ ἰαμβείου." ἐπεὶ δὲ καίτοι λογιώτατος ὢν κατανάλωσεν ἄκων ἅπαντα τὰ τῆς φιλοσοφίας μέρη καὶ ἔλαθεν ἑαυτὸν ἐκπεσὼν τοῦ Αἰσώπου, ἐνθυμεῖται τὰς Ὥρας, ὑφ' ὧν αὐτὸς ἐν κορυφαῖς τοῦ Ὀλύμπου ἐτράφη, ὡς ἐν σπαργάνοις ποτὲ αὐτῷ ὄντι

μῦθον διελθοῦσαι περὶ τῆς βοός, ὃν διελέχθη τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ ἡ βοῦς ὑπὲρ ἑαυτῆς τε καὶ τῆς γῆς,

ἐς ἔρωτα αὐτὸν τῶν τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος βοῶν κατέστησαν, καὶ δίδωσιν ἐντεῦθεν τὴν μυθολογίαν τῷ Αἰσώπῳ, λοιπὴν ἐν σοφίας οἴκῳ οὖσαν "ἔχε", εἰπὼν "ἃ πρῶτα ἔμαθον." αἱ μὲν δὴ πολλαὶ μορφαὶ τῆς τέχνης ἐνθένδε ἀφίκοντο τῷ Αἰσώπῳ, καὶ τοιόνδε ἀπέβη τὸ τῆς μυθολογίας πρᾶγμα.

16 ἴσως δ' ἀνόητον ἔπαθον· ἐπιστρέψαι γὰρ ὑμᾶς διανοηθεὶς ἐς λόγους φυσικωτέρους τε καὶ ἀληθεστέρους ὧν οἱ πολλοὶ περὶ τῆς Αἴτνης ᾄδουσιν, αὐτὸς ἐς ἔπαινον μύθων ἀπηνέχθην, οὐ μὴν ἄχαρις ἡ ἐκβολὴ τοῦ λόγου γέγονεν· ὁ γὰρ μῦθος, ὃν παραιτούμεθα, οὐ τῶν Αἰσώπου λόγων ἐστίν, ἀλλὰ τῶν δραματικωτέρων καὶ ὧν οἱ ποιηταὶ θρυλοῦσιν·...

G43 Philostr. (II/III ?) *Im.* **1.3**

Φοιτῶσιν οἱ μῦθοι παρὰ τὸν Αἴσωπον ἀγαπῶντες αὐτόν, ὅτι αὐτῶν ἐπιμελεῖται.

[sequuntur Hom. 1T3 Hes. 2T10 Archil. 4T16],

...ἀλλ' Αἰσώπῳ πάντα τὰ τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἐκμεμύθωται, καὶ λόγου τοῖς θηρίοις μεταδέδωκε λόγου ἕνεκεν· πλεονεξίαν τε γὰρ ἐπικόπτει καὶ ὕβριν ἐλαύνει καὶ ἀπάτην καὶ ταῦτα λέων τις αὐτῷ ὑποκρίνεται καὶ ἀλώπηξ καὶ ἵππος, νὴ Δία, καὶ οὐδὲ ἡ χελώνη ἄφωνος, ὑφ' ὧν τὰ παιδία μαθηταὶ γίγνονται τῶν τοῦ βίου πραγμάτων. εὐδοκιμοῦντες οὖν οἱ μῦθοι διὰ τὸν Αἴσωπον φοιτῶσιν ἐπὶ τὰς θύρας τοῦ σοφοῦ ταινίαις αὐτὸν ἀναδήσοντες καὶ στεφανώσοντες αὐτὸν θαλλοῦ στεφάνῳ. ὁ δέ, οἶμαί, τινα ὑφαίνει μῦθον. τὸ γὰρ μειδίαμα τοῦ προσώπου καὶ ὀφθαλμοὶ κατὰ γῆς ἑστῶτες τοῦτο δηλοῦσιν· οἶδεν ὁ ζωγράφος, ὅτι αἱ τῶν μύθων φροντίδες ἀνειμένης τῆς ψυχῆς δέονται. φιλοσοφεῖ δὲ ἡ γραφὴ καὶ τὰ τῶν μύθων σώματα, θηρία γὰρ

συμβάλλουσα ἀνθρώποις περιίστησι χορὸν τῷ Αἰσώπῳ ἀπὸ τῆς ἐκείνου σκηνῆς συμπλάσασα, κορυφαία δὲ τοῦ χοροῦ ἡ ἀλώπηξ γέγραπται, χρῆται γὰρ αὐτῇ ὁ Αἴσωπος διακόνῳ τῶν πλείστων ὑποθέσεων, ὥσπερ ἡ κωμῳδία τῷ Δάῳ.

G44 Alex. Aphr. *In Mete.* 2.3

[praecedit Arist. 57T2]

...ἧττον δὲ πρέπει τοῖς τὴν ἀλήθειαν ζητοῦσι μύθους λέγειν·...

[pergit Arist. 57T2]

G45 *PMich.* 6

Περὶ Μύθου

Verso

μυ[θ]ος εστι [λογο]ς εκ ψευδολογιας, την σ[υν]θεσιν λαμβα[ν]ω[ν επι ?]
ψυχαγωγιας ενετου βιου του κατακλαστο[υ]. αρχαιοις εστιν σ[υν-]
ηθεις. ειρητ[αι] δ[ε μ]υθος παρα τω λεγειν [ψευδ]η. συντιθεμαι
μεθοδον [ε]κ τω[ν ζω]ντων ανθρωπω[ν . . .]γαρ το μυθειο-
λεγειν παρα τοις αρχαιοις εστιν τωνδε γ[ενων]· γενη πολ[λ]α.
οι μεν γα[ρ αυ]των Εσωπιοι κα[λ]ουντ[αι τε και Κιλ]ικιοι, οι δε Εγυ-
πτι[ο]ι τε και Κυπριο[ι τε] και Λιβ[υκοι . . . . τ]ε και Συβαριτικοι.
Εσωπιος μεν ουν [μυθ]ος επι [. . . . .] συν-
θεσιν επ[ι τ]ων αλογων ζωων λαμ [about 17 letters]
και Κιλ[ι]κιοι και οι προειρημενο[ι μυθοι? about 8 more letters wanting] Ε-
σωπ[ο]ν α[δ]ιαφορων ⟦αδιαφορ⟧ αλλ [about 16 letters]
[traces of about 7 letters] του[τ]ων [. .] ασθ [about 22 letters]
[traces of a few letters, illegible]
[traces of a few letters, illegible]

Recto

. . .] ου τουτο εκ κεφα[λ]ων τοσωνδε εκ του ασαφους, εκ του ελ-λιπους,
εκ του πλεοναζοντος, εκ του απιθανου, εκ του αδυνατου, εκ του
α[σ]υμφορου, ε[κ] του εσχρου. εαν δε και το μαχημον τη πλασι π[ι]σ-
[του]μενον ευρ[ι]σκωμεν επι του τελους, χρησωμεθα και τη του
μαχημου κεφαλαιου κατασκευη. ανεσκ[ευα]ζομ[ε]ν δε παραδιγ-

ματος ενεκ[α το]ν του κυνος μυθον. ου[κουν ?] μετα τα προοιμεια λε-
[γ]οντε[ς] ασαφως ε̣ι̣ρ̣η̣[. . .]ναι [ειρηκεναι ?] τον του̣ [. . .]συντ [. . .] στα εκ
[Ε]γυ̣π̣τ̣[. .]ο [. . . . . τ]ο κ̣ρεα[ς] αρπασα[ς] ο κ[υ]ωἂν [. . . . ε̣]ν
. .]π[. . .] ον [. . . . .] εν [. . . . .] ασ̣[. . .] ινο[ς τινος ?] εξ οικιας
. . .] κλ̣ετου̣ς [. . . . . . .]μ̣εν αυτικα [. . . . .]ρε̣[. . . .] του̣τον μυ-
[θον about 14 letters] ρον φυ[. . . π̣ .]μ̣ενου του [. . . . ι̣]ριου

G46 Eust. Antioch. *Engast.* 29

ἀλλ’ αἱ μὲν Αἰσώπου λογοποιίαι τοιαῦτα μύθων ἴσασι πλάσματα, οἷα καὶ τὰ μειράκια πολλαχῶς ἐν ταῖς παιδιαῖς ἀστεϊζόμενα παίζει καὶ κορυβαντιῶσαι γραῖαι κωτίλως ἐπᾴδουσι (ἔσθ’ ὅτε ταῦτα δρῶσιν οἴνῳ μὲν ἐπιβρέχουσαι τὸν φάρυγγα συχνῷ, κύλικι δὲ προσέχουσαι καὶ ποτῷ φλυαροῦσιν ἀμέτρως); οἱ μέντοιγε φιλοσοφίας ἤθη πρεσβεύειν ἡγούμενοι καὶ τὰς ἐμμούσους ποιήσεις οἷα ψευδῆ μύθων εἴδη διέβαλλον, ὡς δέον.

G47 Mar. Victor. *Rhet.* 1.17

Deinde, si ita se habebit negotium, utile erit rebus novis vel ridiculis risum iudicibus aut iocum movere, atque id duplici modo: aut ex tempore, si forte clamor aut strepitus alicunde fuerit exortus, aut cogitatis paratisque, ut vel a fabula incipias vel apologo ad praesens negotium pertinentibus. Fabulae sunt, quas fere videmus extitisse ex Phaedris, Medeis, Clytaemnestris aliisue similibus. Apologi sunt ex rebus humilibus conpositae quaedam formae ac species ad vivendum, ut exstat

illa de mure et leone.

Ergo si, inquit, negotii dignitas patietur, risum vel iocum movere oportebit: sin autem tale negotium fuerit, ut iocandum non sit, a re aliqua tristi ac severa commodum erit incipere. "Nam ut" inquit "cibi fastidium nunc dulci re, nunc subamara relevatur", ita, inquit, studium audiendi apud iudices nunc rebus ridiculis, nunc asperioribus redintegratur.

G48 Fortun. *Rhet.* 2.23

Circa rem quot loci sunt? decem: a simili, cuius species sunt quinque: exemplum, similitudo, fabula, imago, exemplum verisimile, id est quod de comoedia sumitur: addunt quidam et apologos, ut sunt Aesopi fabulae.

G49 Iul. Vict. *Rhet.* 6.3

Secuntur hi loci, qui circa rem. Omne enim, quod in quaestionem venit, habet aliquid, cui comparetur, cum quo conferatur, quia est ei aliquid simile est dissimile, est par est contrarium, est maius est minus, est praecedens, est quod simul sit, est quod consequens. Ab his in hunc modum argumenta ducuntur. (...)
Ab apologo, id est fabula, cum inducuntur nota iam et vulgaria quaedam et probandae rei causa ad similitudinem conferuntur.

G50 Jul. *Or.* 7.3, 207a-d

[3, 207a] Τοῦ δὲ τοιούτου [*sc.* τοῦ μύθου] προβαίνοντος καὶ παρὰ τοῖς Ἕλλησιν εὐδοκιμοῦντος, εἵλκυσαν ἐντεῦθεν οἱ ποιηταὶ τὸν αἶνον, ὃς τοῦ μύθου διαφέρει τῷ μὴ πρὸς παῖδας, ἀλλὰ πρὸς ἄνδρας πεποιῆσθαι καὶ μὴ [πρὸς] ψυχαγωγίαν μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ παραίνεσιν ἔχειν τινά· βούλεται γὰρ ἐπικρυπτόμενος παραινεῖν τε καὶ διδάσκειν, ὅταν ὁ λέγων τὸ φανερῶς εἰπεῖν εὐλαβῆται, τὴν παρὰ τῶν ἀκουόντων ὑφορώμενος [b] ἀπέχθειαν.

[sequuntur Hes. 2T11 Archil. 4T20]

Ὁ δὲ δὴ τῶν μύθων Ὅμηρος ἢ Θουκυδίδης ἢ Πλάτων, ἢ ὅτι βούλει καλεῖν αὐτόν, Αἴσωπος ἦν ὁ Σάμιος, δοῦλος οὐ τὴν τύχην μᾶλλον ἢ τὴν προαίρεσιν, οὐκ ἄφρων μὴν οὐδὲ κατ' αὐτὸ τοῦτο ἀνήρ· ᾧ γὰρ ὁ νόμος οὐ μετεδίδου παρρησίας, τούτῳ προσῆκον ἦν ἐσκιαγραφημένας τὰς συμβουλὰς καὶ πεποικιλμένας ἡδονῇ καὶ χάριτι παραφέρειν, ὥσπερ οἶμαι τῶν ἰατρῶν οἱ [d] μὲν ἐλεύθεροι τὸ δέον ἐπιτάττουσιν, ἐὰν δὲ ἅμα τις οἰκέτης γένηται τὴν τύχην καὶ τὴν τέχνην ἰατρός, πράγματα ἔχει κολακεύειν ἅμα, καὶ θεραπεύειν τὸν δεσπότην ἀναγκαζόμενος.

G51 Jul. *Or.* 10, 306c

-Λέγοις ἂν καὶ μάλα ἀσμένῳ, ἐπεὶ καὶ αὐτὸς οὐκ ἀτιμάζω τοὺς μύθους οὐδὲ παντάπασιν ἐξελαύνω τοὺς ὀρθῶς ἔχοντας, ἀκόλουθά σοί τε καὶ φίλῳ τῷ σῷ, μᾶλλον δὲ τῷ κοινῷ, Πλάτωνι διανοούμενος, ἐπεὶ καὶ αὐτῷ πολλὰ ἐν μύθοις ἐσπούδασται.
Λέγεις ναὶ μὰ Δία ταῦτα ἀληθῆ.
Τίς δὲ καὶ ποδαπὸς ὁ μῦθος;
-Οὐ τῶν παλαιῶν τις ὁποίους Αἴσωπος ἐποίησεν, 307a ἀλλ' εἴτε πλάσμα λέγοις Ἑρμοῦ (πεπυσμένος γὰρ αὐτὸν ἐκεῖθέν σοι φράσω), εἴτε καὶ τἀληθὲς οὕτως ἔχει, εἴτε μίξις τίς ἐστιν ἀμφοῖν, ἀληθοῦς καὶ ψεύδους, αὐτὸ ἐπιδείξει τὸ πρᾶγμα.
-Τουτὶ μὲν οὖν ἤδη μυθικῶς ἅμα καὶ ῥητορικῶς ἐξείργασταί σοι τὸ προοίμιον· ἀλλά μοι τὸν λόγον αὐτόν, ὁποῖός ποτέ ἐστιν, ἤδη διέξελθε.

G52 Aus. *Ep.* 9 Green

a *Titiani et Nepotis chronica quasi alios apologos (nam et ipsa instar sunt fabularum) ad nobilitatem tuam misi, gaudens atque etiam glorians fore aliquid quod ad institutionem tuorum sedulitatis meae studio conferatur. libello tamen apologorum antetuli paucos epodos...*
(...)
hi igitur, ut Plautus ait [cf. *Men.* 13], *interim erunt antelogium fabularum...*

b *subnecte et illud leniter:*
'apologos en misit tibi
ab usque Rheni limite
Ausonius, nomen Italum,
praeceptor Augusti tui,
Aesopiam trimetriam,
quam vertit exili stilo
pedestre concinnans opus
fandi Titianus artifex,
ut hic avi ac patris decus
mixto resurgens sanguine
Probianoque atque Anicio,
ut quondam in Albae moenibus
supremus Aenea satus
Silvios Iulis miscuit;
sic iste, qui natus tui,
flos flosculorum Romuli,
nutricis inter lemmata
lallique somniferos modos
suescat peritis fabulis
simul et iocari et discere.'

G53 Aus. *Ep.* 12 Green (=Symm. *Ep.* 1.32)

et tu me audes facundissimorum hominum laude dignari? tu, inquam, mihi ista, qui te ultra emendationem omnium protulisti? aut quisquam ita nitet ut comparatus tibi non sordeat? quis ita ad Aesopi venustatem, quis sophisticas Isocratis conclusiones, quis ita ad enthymemata Demosthenis aut opulentiam Tullianam aut proprietatem nostri Maronis accedat? quis ita affectet singula ut tu imples omnia? quid enim aliud es quam ex omni bonarum artium ingenio collecta perfectio?

G54 Aphth. *Prog.* 1

⟨ΠΕΡΙ ΜΥΘΟΥ⟩

Ὁ μῦθος ποιητῶν μὲν προῆλθε, γεγένηται δὲ καὶ ῥητόρων κοινὸς ἐκ παραινέσεως.

Ἔστι δὲ μῦθος λόγος ψευδὴς εἰκονίζων ἀλήθειαν.

Καλεῖται δὲ Συβαριτικὸς καὶ Κίλιξ καὶ Κύπριος, πρὸς τοὺς εὑρόντας αὐτὸν μεταθεὶς τὰ ὀνόματα· νικᾷ δὲ μᾶλλον Αἰσώπειος λέγεσθαι τῷ τὸν Αἴσωπον ἄριστα πάντων συγγράψαι τοὺς μύθους.

Τοῦ δὲ μύθου τὸ μέν ἐστι λογικόν, τὸ δὲ ἠθικόν, τὸ δὲ μικτόν· καὶ λογικὸν μέν, ἐν ᾧ τι ποιῶν ἄνθρωπος πέπλασται, ἠθικὸν δὲ τὸ τῶν ἀλόγων ἦθος ἀπομιμούμενον, μικτὸν δὲ τὸ ἐξ ἀμφοτέρων, ἀλόγου καὶ λογικοῦ.

Τὴν δὲ παραίνεσιν, δι' ἣν ὁ μῦθος τέτακται, προτάττων μὲν ὀνομάσεις προμύθιον, ἐπιμύθιον δὲ τελευταῖον ἐπενεγκών.

Ἠθικὸς μῦθος ὁ τῶν τεττίγων καὶ τῶν μυρμήκων προτρέπων τοὺς νέους εἰς πόνους.

Θέρους ἦν ἀκμὴ καὶ οἱ μὲν τέττιγες μουσικὴν ἀνεβάλλοντο σύντονον, τοῖς μύρμηξι δὲ πονεῖν ἐπῄει καὶ συλλέγειν καρπούς, ἐξ ὧν ἔμελλον τοῦ χειμῶνος τραφήσεσθαι. χειμῶνος δὲ ἐπιγεγονότος μύρμηκες μὲν οἷς ἐπόνουν ἐτρέφοντο, τοῖς δὲ ἡ τέρψις ἐτελεύτα πρὸς ἔνδειαν.

Οὕτω νεότης πονεῖν οὐκ ἐθέλουσα παρὰ τὸ γῆρας κακοπραγεῖ.

G55 Him. *Or.* 46.4-5

4 φασὶ δὲ καὶ Αἴσωπον τὸν λογοποιὸν τὸν Φρύγα, οὗ μὴ ὅτι τοὺς λόγους τινές, ἀλλ' ἤδη καὶ αὐτὸ τὸ πρόσωπον καὶ τὴν φωνὴν γέλωτα καὶ χλεύην ἥγηντο, γενέσθαι μὲν πάνσοφον καὶ διὰ τοῦτο ἱερὸν τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος· Δελφοὺς δέ, καὶ ταῦτα παροικοῦντας μαντικῷ τῷ θεῷ, οὕτως ἀγνοῆσαι τὸν ἄνδρα, ὥστε ψῆφον ἄδικον ἐπ' αὐτῷ κομίσαντας ῥῖψαι κατὰ σκοπέλων καὶ ἀφανίσαι τὸν Αἴσωπον. 5 ἀλλ' οὔτε ἡ μήτηρ ἠμέλει μετὰ τὴν λύραν Ὀρφέως, οὔτε τοῦ Φρυγὸς ὁ Ἀπόλλων· (...) Δελφοὶ δὲ τῆς εἰς Αἴσωπον ὕβρεως ἔδοσαν δίκας αὐτῷ τῷ πατρίῳ θεῷ.

G56 Him. *Or.* 66

1 Πάλιν μύθῳ πρὸς τὸν παρόντα χρησόμεθα· πάλιν ἐλθεῖν μοι συνέριθον παρακαλέσω τὸν Αἴσωπον. λόγον δὲ ὑμῖν οὐ Λιβυκόν τινα, ἢ Αἰγύπτιον, ἀλλ' ἐκ μέσων τῶν πάνυ Φρυγῶν, ὅπου καὶ τὸ πρῶτον ὁ μῦθος ἐγένετο, ἐν αὐτοῖς εὑρὼν τοῖς Αἰσωπείοις ἀθύρμασιν, ἐθέλω καὶ πρὸς ὑμᾶς διηγήσασθαι.

2 ὁ Ἀπόλλων ἐπειδὰν εἰς μέλος ἁρμόσῃ τὴν λύραν -ἁρμόζει δὲ οἶμαι ἀεί, ἅτε οὐδὲν ἄλλο τι ὢν ὅτι μὴ λύρα καὶ λόγος-, περιίστανται μὲν αὐτὸν πανταχόθεν αἱ Μοῦσαι, καὶ χορὸς τῇ λύρᾳ γίνονται· ἀτὰρ δὴ καὶ ἄλλος ὅμιλος θεατὴς μελῳδίας ἔρχεται, Δρυάδες τινὲς καὶ Ἁμαδρυάδες νύμφαι, ὄρειοι δαίμονες, καὶ οὐκ οἶδα εἰ πάμπαν ἀτάσθαλοι. αἱ δὲ ὅταν μὲν ἅμα ταῖς Μούσαις χορεύειν βούλωνται, θεαί τε εἶναι δοκοῦσι καὶ ὡσπερεὶ Μοῦσαι νομίζονται· ἐπειδὰν δέ τι πρὸς τὴν ἀκοὴν ἄγροικόν τε καὶ πονηρὸν σκίρτημα κατὰ τῆς λύρας σκιρτήσωσιν, ἀγανακτεῖ μὲν ὁ Ἀπόλλων -τί δὲ οὐ μέλλει; ἐπειδὰν ἀμουσοτάτου χοροῦ πηδῶντος αἰσθάνηται, -οὐ μὴν εὐθὺς ἐπὶ βέλη καὶ φαρέτραν ἔρχεται·

3 οὐ γὰρ οἷα περὶ αὐτοῦ λέγειν ἐν Ἰλιάδι τετόλμηκεν Ὅμηρος, τοιαῦτα καὶ Αἴσωπος μυθολογεῖ κατὰ τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος. Ὅμηρος μὲν γὰρ δημαγωγεῖν ἐθέλων τὸ θέατρον, πολλάκις καὶ θεῶν καταψεύδεται· διόπερ ἔγωγε τοιούτους εἶναι ἑκὼν οὐ πείσομαι, ἀλλά μοι συγγνώμην ἔχειν Ὁμηρίδας αἰτήσομαι, εἰ τοιαῦτα περὶ θεῶν καὶ αὐτὸς ⟨οὐ⟩ δήπου προσίεμαι. ποῦ γὰρ ἂν ἔγωγε ταῦτα πιστεύσαιμι, ὅτι θεὸς ὢν Ἀπόλλων καὶ μουσηγέτης, ἀεὶ θυμοῦται τοσοῦτον, ὁπόσον Ὅμηρος βούλεται, ἢ εἰς νύκτα ἀμείβει τὰ πρόσωπα, ἢ διὰ τοῦτο βελῶν ἅπτεται, ἵνα ὑπήκοον πλήξῃ καὶ Ἕλληνα; ταῦτα μὲν οὖν παραιτησώμεθα Ὁμηρίδας καὶ εἴ τις ἄλλος ποιητὴς τοιοῦτος ᾖ κατὰ θεῶν εὐχερῶς ἐθέλων ψεύδεσθαι, Αἰσώπῳ δὲ μᾶλλον πιστεύσωμεν. 4 παρακαλεῖ γὰρ καὶ θεοὺς αὐτοὺς ἐπὶ τὸν μῦθον ὁ Αἴσωπος καὶ εἰς οὐρανοὺς αὐτοὺς ἀναβιβάζει τὸν ἔλεγχον· οὐ μὴν ἴσα ποιηταῖς ὁ Φρὺξ ἐθέλει κατὰ θεῶν θρασύνεσθαι, ἀλλὰ καίπερ μύθων ποιητὴς ὤν, ὅσον αἰνίξασθαί τι σοφόν, περὶ θεῶν λέγει καὶ φθέγγεται.

5 τί οὖν ἐκεῖνος, ἀτακτοῦντος χοροῦ ἐν γραφῇ; ποιεῖ τὸν Ἀπόλλωνα μεθαρμόζοντα ἐκ προσηνοῦς εἰς τραχὺ μέλος τὴν λύραν, καὶ οὐ δακτύλοις, πλήκτρῳ δὲ τὰς χορδὰς πλήττοντα· καὶ συναγανακτεῖ μὲν αὐτῷ πρὸς Νυμφῶν ἀδικουμένῳ κατ' Αἴσωπον ὄρη καὶ νάπαι καὶ ποταμοὶ καὶ ὄρνιθες, ἤδη δὲ καὶ ὁ Ἑλικὼν αὐτὸς ὑπὸ τοῦ πάθους μεταβληθεὶς εἰς ἄνθρωπον, φωνήν τε ἀφίησι καὶ κατὰ Νυμφῶν ῥήτωρ γίνεται. καὶ μὴ τολμηρὸν τὸ τοῦ μύθου νομίζωμεν· οὐ γὰρ δήπου αὐτὸς μὲν ὁ Ἑλικὼν ἐκ ποιμένων οἶδε ποιητὰς ἐργάζεσθαι -καὶ τοῦτο πάντως Ἡσιόδῳ πιστεύομεν-, ἡμᾶς δὲ τῷ Φρυγὶ νεμεσᾶν ἄξιον, ὅτι λαλοῦν ὄρος τι μεμίμηται. 6 τί δὲ δὴ ὁ Ἑλικὼν πρὸς τὰς Νύμφας ἐν τῷ μύθῳ φθέγγεται; "Ποῖ φέρεσθε, ὦ Νύμφαι; τίς οὗτος ὑμᾶς πονηρὸς οἶστρος ἐξέμηνε; τί δὲ ἀφεῖσαι τὸν Ἑλικῶνα, τὸ τῶν Μουσῶν ἐργαστήριον, ἐπὶ τὸν Κιθαιρῶνα σπεύδετε;

συμφοραὶ ἐκεῖ καὶ πάθη καὶ τραγῳδίας πηγὴ τὰ Κιθαιρῶνος ἐγκώμια. ἐγὼ ποιητὰς ἐκ ποιμένων, ὁ δὲ ἄφρονας ἐκ σωφρονούντων ἐργάζεται· ἐκεῖ μήτηρ κατὰ παιδὸς μαίνεται, καὶ πολεμεῖ τὸ γένος τῷ γένει· ἐνταῦθα Μουσῶν γοναὶ καὶ Μνημοσύνης κῆποι καὶ αἱ τῶν γεννηθέντων τροφαί. Ἀπόλλωνι μὲν οὖν συγχορευταὶ καὶ ξυμπαίστριαι νῦν τε εἰσὶ καὶ ἀεὶ πάντως μελῳδοῦντι παρέπονται· τὸ δὲ ὑμέτερον πάθος δέδοικα, μὴ σκηνῆς τι μέρος καὶ σκυθρωπῆς ὑμῖν προοίμιον τραγῳδίας γένηται. 7 ἀλλὰ τί ταῦτα; φθάνουσι δήπου τάχα τῆς ἐμῆς δημηγορίας τὸ πέρας αἱ Νύμφαι· ἡ μὲν ἐκεῖ που πρὸς τὸν θεὸν τῶν Νυμφῶν, ἡ δὲ μέλλει, ἡ δὲ ὅσον οὔπω τῷ χορῷ τούτῳ προσπείσεται. δειναὶ γὰρ αἱ τῆς Ἀπόλλωνος λύρας ἴυγγες καὶ πάντα κεστὸν Ἀφροδίτης παριοῦσαι ταῖς χάρισι." ταῦτα ὁ Ἑλικὼν παρὰ Αἰσώπῳ δημηγορεῖ.

εἰ δέ τι φέρει πρὸς τὸν παρόντα ὁ μῦθος, ὑμέτερον ἂν εἴη στοχάζεσθαι.

G57 Them. *Or.* 22, 278c

Αἰσώπου δὲ τοῦ μυθοποιοῦ πολλαχῇ τε ἄλλῃ μνημονεύειν ἐπωφελὲς καὶ ὅσα εἰς διαβολὴν εὖ ἔχοντα ἀπολέλοιπεν. ἀεὶ μὲν γὰρ αὐτὴν τῇ ἀλώπεκι περιτίθησι, δολερῷ καὶ ἀνάνδρῳ θηρίῳ, ποιεῖ δὲ ὑπ' αὐτῆς ἁλισκόμενα τῶν ζῴων τὰ ἀλκιμώτατα. Καὶ ὅντινα ἔχω πρόχειρον μῦθον εἴποιμ' ἂν ὑμῖν, εἴ μου πράως ἀνέξεσθε παραβαλλομένου τοῖς σοφισταῖς.

ταύρω δύο μιᾶς ἡγεῖσθον ἀγέλης, ξυννόμω τε ὄντε καὶ ὅτι μάλιστα φίλω. ὁ λέων δὲ αὐτοῖν τὴν ξύστασιν ἐδεδίει, καὶ οὔτε αὐτοὺς ἐθάρσει οὔτε δι' αὐτοὺς τὴν ἀγέλην. κακῶς οὖν ὑπὸ λιμοῦ διακείμενος ἔρχεται ἐπὶ τὴν κερδὼ καὶ ξυμμαχίαν ὁμολογοῦσι. τῇ δὲ ἄρα τοσοῦτον κακουργίας καὶ δεινότητος περιῆν ὥστε προσενεγκοῦσα τὴν μηχανὴν διέστησέ τε αὐτὼ καὶ ἐξέμηνε κατ' ἀλλήλοιν, καὶ παραδέδωκε τῷ λέοντι δίχα ἑκάτερον εὐτρεπῆ καὶ εὔκολον θήραν.

τοῦτο μὲν ἡ τοῦ Αἰσώπου κερδώ.

G58 Sopat. Rh. *ap.* Jo. Sard. (cf. Doxap. *Comm. in Aphth.* (pp. 161-162 Walz))

1. Μῦθος

Σώπατρος δὲ οὕτω τὸν μῦθον ὡρίσατο· μῦθός ἐστι πλάσμα πιθανῶς πρὸς εἰκόνα τῶν τῇ ἀληθείᾳ συμβαινόντων πραγμάτων συγκείμενον, συμβουλήν τινα τοῖς ἀνθρώποις ἢ ὑπογραφὴν ⟨τῶν⟩ πραγμάτων ποιούμενον. πλάσμα μέν, διότι πρὸς τὸ δοκοῦν ἡμῖν πρᾶγμα καὶ πλάττεται. γίνεται δὲ πιθανός, ὅτι κατὰ τὴν φύσιν ἢ τὴν ἀξίαν

ἑνὸς ἑκάστου ζῴου τοὺς λόγους ἢ τὰ πράγματα πλάττομεν· τοῦ μὲν γὰρ λέοντος ὄντος βασιλικοῦ βασιλικὸν ἐπινοοῦμεν τὸ φρόνημα, τῆς δὲ ἀλώπεκος οὔσης κακούργου κακοῦργον ἀναπλάττομεν τὴν διάνοιαν, δειλοῦ δὲ καὶ ἀναισθήτου τοῦ ἐλάφου κατὰ τὸν αὐτὸν τρόπον· ὥστε εἴ τι τούτων παραλλάξαιμεν, ἀπίθανος ὁ λόγος γενήσεται. ἐκ δὲ τῶν τῇ ἀληθείᾳ συμβαινόντων ἔχει τὴν σύνθεσιν, ὅτι πρὸς τὰ συμβαίνοντα τοῖς ἀνθρώποις ἀποβλέποντες οὕτω πρὸς εἰκόνα τὸν μῦθον συντίθεμεν· οἷον

ἰδόντες πολλοὺς διὰ κέρδος τι περιττὸν πράττοντας καὶ τὸ προσὸν ἀπολέσαντες καὶ δι' ἡδονὴν ἄλλως τὴν οἰκείαν προδόντας ἀσφάλειαν οὕτω τὸν τοῦ κυνὸς ⟨τοῦ τὸ κρέας φέροντος παρὰ τὸν ποταμόν⟩ καὶ τὸν τοῦ λέοντος τοῦ τῆς κόρης ἐρῶντος μῦθον ἀνεπλάσαμεν.

παράστασιν δὲ ἢ συμβουλὴν ἀποτελεῖ πραγμάτων, καθὸ ἢ πράττειν ἢ μὴ πράττειν προτρέπομεν, ἢ παριστῶμεν οἷα τοῖς ἀνθρώποις ἀποβαίνει τὰ πράγματα· οἷον

ἐκ μὲν φήμης ψιλῆς ὡς πολλοὶ τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἠπάτηνται, ὡς ἐπὶ τοῦ ἰξευτοῦ τοῦ θηρῶντος τὸν τέττιγα, ἐκ δὲ τῶν ὑποκρινομένων τὸ φοβερόν τε καὶ ἀρχικόν, ὡς ἐπὶ τοῦ ὄνου τοῦ περιθέντος ἑαυτῷ τὴν λεοντῆν.

G59 Avian. *Praef.*

Dubitanti mihi, Theodosi optime, quonam litterarum titulo nostri nominis memoriam mandaremus, fabularum textus occurrit, quod in his urbane concepta falsitas deceat et non incumbat necessitas ueritatis. Nam quis tecum de oratione, quis de poemate loqueretur, cum in utroque litterarum genere et Atticos Graeca eruditione superes et latinitate Romanos? Huius ergo materiae ducem nobis Aesopum noueris, qui responso Delphici Apollinis monitus ridicula orsus est, ut legenda firmaret.

[sequitur Socr. 46T5]

Quas Graecis iambis Babrius repetens in duo uolumina coartauit. Phaedrus etiam partem aliquam quinque in libellos resoluit. De his ergo ad quadraginta et duas in unum redactas fabulas dedi, quas rudi latinitate compositas elegis sum explicare conatus. Habes ergo opus quo animum oblectes, ingenium exerceas, sollicitudinem leues totumque uiuendi ordinem cautus agnoscas. Loqui uero arbores, feras cum hominibus gemere, uerbis certare uolucres, animalia ridere fecimus, ut pro singulorum necessitatibus uel ab ipsis in*animis sententia proferatur.*

G60 Macr. *Comm.* 1.2.7-11

7 *Fabulae, quarum nomen indicat falsi professionem, aut tantum conciliandae auribus voluptatis, aut adhortationis quoque in bonam frugem gratia repertae sunt.*

8 *auditum mulcent vel comoediae, quales Menander eiusve imitatores agendas dederunt, vel argumenta fictis casibus amatorum referta, quibus vel multum se Arbiter exercuit vel Apuleium non numquam lusisse miramur. hoc totum fabularum genus, quod solas aurium delicias profitetur, e sacrario suo in nutricum cunas sapientiae tractatus eliminat.* 9 *ex his autem quae ad quandam virtutem speciem intellectum legentis hortantur fit secunda discretio. in quibusdam enim et argumentum ex ficto locatur et per mendacia ipse relationis ordo contexitur, ut sunt illae Aesopi fabulae elegantia fictionis illustres, at in aliis argumentum quidem fundatur veri soliditate sed haec ipsa veritas per quaedam composita et ficta profertur, et hoc iam vocatur narratio fabulosa, non fabula, ut sunt cerimoniarum sacra, ut Hesiodi et Orphei quae de deorum progenie actuve narrantur, ut mystica Pythagoreorum sensa referuntur.* 10 *ex hac ergo secunda divisione quam diximus, a philosophiae libris prior species, quae concepta de falso per falsum narratur, aliena est. sequens in aliam rursum discretionem scissa dividitur: nam cum veritas argumento subest solaque fit narratio fabulosa, non unus reperitur modus per figmentum vera referendi.* 11 *aut enim contextio narrationis per turpia et indigna numinibus ac monstro similia componitur...aut sacrarum rerum notio sub pio figmentorum velamine honestis et tecta rebus et vestita nominibus enuntiatur: et hoc est solum figmenti genus quod cautio de divinis rebus philosophantis admittit.*

G61 Syn. *Insomn.* 19, 154D-155A

οὐδὲν γὰρ οὕτως ἐνυπνίων, ὡς τὸ κλέψαι τοὺν μέσῳ, καὶ μὴ σὺν χρόνῳ ποιῆσαι· εἶτα προβατίοις τε διαλέγεται. καὶ τὴν βληχὴν ἡγεῖται φωνήν, καὶ λεγόντων ξυνίησιν. οὕτω μὲν καινόν, οὕτω δὲ πολὺ τὸ πλάτος τῶν ὑποθέσεων, εἴ τις αὐταῖς ἐπαφιέναι τοὺς λόγους θαρσήσειεν. ἐγὼ μὲν γὰρ οἶμαι καὶ τοὺς μύθους ἐξουσίαν παρὰ τῶν ἐνυπνίων λαβεῖν, οἷς καὶ ταὼς καὶ ἀλώπηξ καὶ θάλαττα φθέγγονται. ὀλίγα [155 A] ταῦτα πρὸς τὴν αὐτονομίαν τῶν ὕπνων. ἀλλὰ καίπερ ἐλαχίστη μερὶς τῶν ἐνυπνίων ὄντες οἱ μῦθοι, ὅμως ὑπὸ τῶν σοφιστῶν ἠγαπήθησαν εἰς παρασκευὴν ἑρμηνείας. καίτοιγε οἷς ἀρχὴ τῆς τέχνης ὁ μῦθος, πρέπον ἂν γένοιτο τέλος ἐνύπνιον· καὶ πρόσεστι τὸ μὴ μάτην ἠσκηκέναι τὴν γλῶτταν, ὥσπερ ἐπὶ τῶν μύθων, ἀλλ᾽ εἶναι καὶ γνώμῃ σοφώτερον.

G62 Mart. Cap. 5.49 (558)

Circa rem loci sunt decem: a simili, cuius species sunt quinque: exemplum, similitudo, fabula, imago, id est verisimile, quod de comoedia sumitur; addunt quidam et apologos, ut sunt Aesopi. Ergo circa rem locos exequar, qui sunt a dissimili, pari, a contrario, per positionem et negationem, ad aliquid, quod figuratur casibus quattuor, genetivo, dativo, accusativo, ablativo: ab inter se collidentibus

per habitionem et amissionem, a maiore ad minus, a minore ad maius, a praecedenti, ab eo quod simul est, vel a coniunctis, a consequentibus.

G63 Aug. *c. mend. ad Consent.* 28

Alioquin erunt cuncta mendacia, quae propter quandam rerum significandarum similitudinem, cum gesta non sint, tanquam gesta narrantur. Unde est illa de duobus unius hominis filiis, maiore qui mansit apud patrem suum, et minore qui longe peregrinatus est, tam prolixa narratio [*Ev. Lc.* 15.11]. *In quo genere fingendi humana etiam facta vel dicta irrationalibus animantibus et rebus sensu carentibus homines addiderunt, ut eius modi fictis narrationibus, sed veracibus significationibus, quod vellent commendatius intimarent. Nec apud auctores tantum saecularium litterarum, ut*

apud Horatium mus loquitur muri [*S.* 2.6.79-117], *et mustela vulpeculae* [*Ep.* 1.7.29-33],

ut per narrationem fictam ad id quod agitur, vera significatio referatur; unde et Aesopi tales fabulas ad eum finem relatas, nullus tam ineruditus fuit, qui putaret appellanda mendacia: sed in litteris quoque sacris, sicut

in libro Iudicum [9.8-15] *ligna sibi regem requirunt, et loquuntur ad oleam et ad ficum et ad vitem et ad rubum.*

Quod utique totum fingitur, ut ad rem quae intenditur, ficta quidem narratione, non mendaci tamen, sed veraci significatione veniatur.

G64a Nicol. *Prog.* 1

...· καὶ πρῶτον μὲν περὶ τοῦ μύθου [*sc.* λεκτέον]. ὥσπερ γὰρ τὸ ἐν ⟨ταῖς⟩ τελείαις ὑποθέσεσι δυσχερὲς φεύγοντες εὗρον τὴν τῶν προγυμνασμάτων χρείαν οἱ ταῦτα διατάξαντες, οὕτω καὶ τούτων τὸν μῦθον προέταξαν ὡς φύσει τε ὄντα ἀφελῆ καὶ τῶν ἄλλων ἁπλούστερον καὶ ὡς συγγενείᾳ τινὶ χρώμενον πρὸς τὰ ποιήματα, ἀφ' ὧν μεταβαίνοντας τοὺς νέους ἐπὶ τὴν ῥητορικὴν οὐκ ἀθρόως ἔδει ξένοις τε καὶ μηδαμῶς συνήθεσιν ἐντυγχάνειν. περὶ τούτου οὖν πρῶτον λεκτέον.

Περὶ μύθου.

Μῦθος τοίνυν ἐστὶ λόγος ψευδὴς τῷ πιθανῶς συγκεῖσθαι εἰκονίζων τὴν ἀλήθειαν. λόγος μὲν ψευδής, ἐπειδὴ ὁμολογουμένως ἐκ ψεύδους σύγκειται· εἰκονίζων δὲ τὴν ἀλήθειαν, ἐπειδὴ οὐκ ἂν ἐργάσαιτο τὸ ἑαυτοῦ, μὴ ἔχων τινὰ πρὸς τὸ ἀληθὲς ὁμοιότητα. γένοιτο δὲ ἂν πρὸς τὸ ἀληθὲς ὅμοιος ἐκ τοῦ πιθανοῦ τοῦ περὶ τὴν πλάσιν. - Εἴρηται δὲ μῦθος ἀπὸ τοῦ μυθεῖσθαι, ὅπερ ἐστὶ λέγειν, οὐχ ὅτι καὶ ἐν ⟨τοῖς⟩ ἄλλοις οὐ λέγομεν, ἀλλ' ὅτι ἐν αὐτῷ πρῶτον τὸ λέγειν πο-

λιτικῶς μανθάνομεν. τινὲς δὲ αὐτὸν καὶ αἶνον ἐκάλεσαν ἀπὸ τῆς δι' αὐτοῦ παραινέσεως.

Τῶν δὲ μύθων οἳ μὲν ὀνομαζέσθωσαν Αἰσώπειοι, οἳ δὲ Συβαριτικοί, οἳ δὲ Λύδιοι, οἳ δὲ Φρύγιοι, ἀπὸ τόπων τινῶν ἢ προσώπων τὰς προσηγορίας ἔχοντες. εἰσὶ δὲ οἱ ⟨μὲν⟩ Συβαριτικοὶ ⟨οἱ ἐκ μόνων λογικῶν ζῴων, Αἰσώπειοι δὲ⟩ οἱ ἐξ ἀλόγων καὶ λογικῶν συγκείμενοι, Λύδιοι δὲ καὶ Φρύγιοι οἱ ἐκ μόνων ἀλόγων. εἰσὶ δέ τινες μῦθοι καὶ ἐκ θεῶν συγκείμενοι, οἷόν ἐστιν "ἡ Ἥρα συνῴκει τῷ Διί", οὓς φιλοσοφίᾳ μᾶλλον προσήκειν οἴομαι· ἐκείνης γάρ ἐστιν εὐκρινεῖν τὰς ἀλληγορίας τὰς ἐν αὐτοῖς. ἰστέον δὲ καὶ ὅτι τοὺς περὶ θεῶν μύθους τινὲς οὐ μύθους ἀλλὰ μυθικὰ ἐκάλεσαν διηγήματα, ἀναμιγνύντες αὐτὰ τοῖς περὶ τῶν μεταμορφώσεων λόγοις καὶ τῶν ἐκείναις παραπλησίων. ὁποτέρως δ' ἂν ἔχοι, τὰς ἐν αὐτοῖς ἀλληγορίας ἀναπτύξουσιν οἱ φιλόσοφοι. ἡμεῖς δὲ ἢ πιθανὸν ἢ ἀπίθανον ὡς ἐν πολιτικῷ λόγῳ παραληψόμεθα.

Ἐπειδὴ δὲ εἴρηται, ὅτι δεῖ πιθανῶς συγκεῖσθαι τὸν μῦθον, πόθεν ἂν γένοιτο πιθανὸς σκοπητέον. πολλαχόθεν δὲ τοῦτο· ἐκ τόπων, περὶ οὓς τὰ ὑποκείμενα ⟨τῷ λόγῳ⟩ ζῷα διατρίβειν εἴωθεν· ⟨ἐκ καιρῶν, ἐν οἷς φαίνεσθαι φιλεῖ·⟩ ἐκ λόγων τῶν τῇ φύσει ⟨ἑκάστου⟩ ἁρμοζόντων· ἐκ πραγμάτων, ἃ μὴ ὑπερβαίνει τὴν ἑκάστου ποιότητα, ἵνα μὴ λέγωμεν, ὅτι ὁ μῦς περὶ βασιλείας τῶν ζῴων ἐβουλεύετο ἢ ὅτι ὁ λέων ἐζωγρήθη ὑπὸ τυροῦ [καὶ] κνίσης, κἂν λόγους τινὰς δεήσῃ περιθεῖναι, [καὶ] ἵνα ἡ μὲν ἀλώπηξ ποικίλα φθέγγηται, τὰ δὲ πρόβατα εὐήθη καὶ μεστὰ ἀνοίας· τοιαύτη γάρ τις ἡ ἑκατέρων φύσις· καὶ ἵνα ὁ μὲν ἀετὸς ἁρπακτικὸς καὶ νεβρῶν καὶ ἀρνίων εἰσάγηται, ὁ δὲ κολοιὸς μηδὲν τοιοῦτον μηδὲ ἐννοῶν. εἰ δὲ ἄρα ποτὲ γένοιτο χρεία τοῦ καὶ παρὰ τὴν φύσιν τι συμπλάσαι, δεῖ τοῦτο προοικονομῆσαι καὶ παρασχεῖν αὐτῷ τὴν ἐκ τοῦ μύθου διάνοιαν· οἷον εἰ διαλέγοιτο τὰ πρόβατα πρὸς τοὺς λύκους φιλικῶς, προοικονομῆσαι δεῖ τὴν φιλίαν καὶ ὅσα ἄλλα τοιαῦτα.

Εἰρήκαμεν δέ, ὅτι τῶν προγυμνασμάτων τὰ ⟨μὲν⟩ τοῦ συμβουλευτικοῦ ἐστι, τὰ δὲ τοῦ δικανικοῦ, τὰ δὲ τοῦ πανηγυρικοῦ. ὁ τοίνυν μῦθός ἐστι μὲν προδήλως τοῦ συμβουλευτικοῦ· ἢ γὰρ προτρέπομεν ⟨ἐπὶ τὰ ἀγαθὰ⟩ ἢ τῶν ἁμαρτημάτων ἀποτρέπομεν. ἤδη δέ τισιν ἔδοξε καὶ πρὸς τὴν τῶν τριῶν ⟨εἰδῶν⟩ μελέτην ⟨εἶναι⟩ χρήσιμος· "ἐν ᾧ μὲν γὰρ" φασί "προτρέπομεν ἢ ἀποτρέπομεν, τὸ τῆς συμβουλῆς ἴδιον φυλάττεται, ἐν ᾧ δὲ καταδρομὴν τῶν ἁμαρτημάτων ποιούμεθα, τὸ δικανικὸν μέρος σῴζεται, ἐν ᾧ δὲ καθαρᾷ τῇ λέξει χρώμεθα καὶ μετὰ ἀφελείας προάγομεν ἐπαινοῦντες ἅμα, τῆς πανηγυρικῆς ἰδέας οὐκ ἀφιστάμεθα. ἔτι δὲ καὶ ἔθος" φασίν "ἐν ταῖς πα-

νηγυρικαῖς ὑποθέσεσι καὶ μύθους παραλαμβάνειν." καὶ οἱ τοῦτον δοξάζοντες τὸν τρόπον διὰ τοῦτο καὶ τὴν πρώτην αὐτῷ τάξιν ἀποδεδώκασιν, ἐπειδὴ πρὸς τὰ τρία ἡμᾶς" φασί "γυμνάζει τὰ τῆς ῥητορικῆς μέρη." ὅτι δὲ τοῦ συμβουλευτικοῦ προδήλως ἐστί, [καὶ] οὐδεὶς ⟨ἂν⟩ ἀμφισβητήσειεν· μετὰ γὰρ τῆς ψυχαγωγίας ὠφελεῖ τοὺς πειθομένους, ἀποτρέπων μὲν τῶν φαύλων, τῶν δὲ ἀγαθῶν ἐφίεσθαι παραινῶν καὶ μετὰ ἡδύτητος ἐθίζων τῆς ὠφελείας ἀντέχεσθαι.

Συντελέσειε δ' ἂν καὶ -πέντε μερῶν τοῦ λόγου ἔτι ὄντων- εἰς διδασκαλίαν τῆς διηγήσεως· καὶ γὰρ ἐν αὐτῷ τῷ πλάττειν μανθάνομεν, ὅπως δεῖ τὰ γινόμενα διηγεῖσθαι.

Ἐπιμύθιον δέ ἐστι λόγος ὁ πρὸς τὸν μῦθον ἐκφερόμενος καὶ δηλῶν τὸ ἐν αὐτῷ χρήσιμον. τοῦτο δὲ τριχῶς ἐκφέρουσιν, ἢ παραδειγματικῶς ἢ ἐνθυμηματικῶς ἢ προσφωνητικῶς. παραδειγματικῶς μὲν οἷον· οὗτος ἡμᾶς ὁ μῦθος διδάσκει τόδε τι ποιεῖν ἢ μὴ ποιεῖν. ἐνθυμηματικῶς δέ, ὅταν λέγωμεν οὕτως· ὁ γὰρ μὴ τόδε τι ποιῶν κατηγορίας ἄξιος. προσφωνητικῶς δὲ οἷον· καὶ σὺ δέ, ὦ παῖ, τῶνδε ἢ τῶνδε ἀπέχου. τινὲς δὲ καὶ τὸ ἐπιμύθιον τοῦτο προτάττουσι καὶ ὀνομάζουσιν αὐτὸ προμύθιον. οἱ δὲ ἐμφρονέστερον καὶ ἀκολουθότερον διαιροῦντες ᾠήθησαν δεῖν πάντως αὐτὸ τάττειν ἐπὶ τῷ μύθῳ, λέγοντες ὅτι "εἰ καὶ διὰ τοῦτο τὸν μῦθον εὕρομεν διὰ τὸ τοὺς νέους μὴ ἡδέως δέχεσθαι τὰς φανερὰς νουθετήσεις, ἵνα ψυχαγωγούμενοι καὶ ἀπατώμενοι παρὰ τῆς ἡδονῆς τῆς ἐν τῷ μύθῳ οὕτως ἀκούωσιν ἤδη τῆς παραινέσεως, πῶς οὐ δεῖ τάττειν μετὰ τὸν μῦθον τὸ ἐξ αὐτοῦ χρήσιμον; ἐπεί, εἰ προσδέχοιντο τὴν παραίνεσιν, περιττή ἐστιν ἡ τοῦ μύθου χρῆσις."

Δεῖ δὲ τὴν φράσιν ἁπλουστέραν τε εἶναι καὶ ἀνεπιβούλευτον καὶ δεινότητος ἁπάσης καὶ περιοδικῆς ἀπαγγελίας ἀπηλλαγμένην, ὥστε καὶ τὸ βούλημα εἶναι σαφὲς καὶ τὰ λεγόμενα μὴ μείζω τῆς τῶν ὑποκειμένων προσώπων ποιότητος φαίνεσθαι, καὶ μάλιστα ὅταν ἐξ ἀλόγων ζῴων ὁ μῦθος ὑπάρχῃ συγκείμενος. καθόλου δὲ [ἁπλῶς] ἐπὶ τὸ ἁπλούστερον καὶ ὀλίγον τῆς ἐν τῇ συνηθείᾳ ὁμιλίας ἐξαλλάττον τὰ τῆς φράσεως προακτέον.

G64b Nicol. *Prog.* 2

ἔτι τῶν διηγημάτων τὰ μέν ἐστι μυθικά, τὰ δὲ ἱστορικά, τὰ δὲ πραγματικά, ἃ καὶ δικανικὰ καλοῦσι, τὰ δὲ πλασματικά. μυθικὰ μὲν οὖν ἐστι τὰ οὐκ ἀναμφισβητήτου πίστεως ἠξιωμένα, ἀλλ' ἔχοντα καὶ ψευδοῦς ὑπόνοιαν, οἷα τὰ περὶ Κυκλώπων καὶ Κενταύρων· ἱστορικὰ δὲ ⟨τὰ⟩ τῶν ὁμολογουμένως γενομένων παλαιῶν πραγμάτων, οἷα τὰ περὶ Ἐπιδάμνου· πραγματικὰ δὲ ἤτοι δικανικὰ τὰ ἐν τοῖς πολιτικοῖς ἀγῶσι λεγόμενα· πλασματικὰ δὲ τὰ ἐν ταῖς κωμῳδίαις καὶ ὅλως τὰ ἐν τοῖς ἄλλοις δράμασι.

κοινωνεῖ δὲ τὰ μυθικὰ διγήματα τοῖς μύθοις [ἐν] τῷ ἀμφότερα δεῖσθαι πίστεως, διαφέρει δέ, ὅτι οἱ μὲν μῦθοι ὁμολογουμένως εἰσὶ ψευδεῖς καὶ πεπλασμένοι, τὰ δὲ μυθικὰ διηγήματα καὶ παρ' ἄλλων ὡς γεγονότα ἱστόρηται καὶ τῶν ἐνδεχομένων ἐστὶ γενέσθαι καὶ μὴ γενέσθαι. ἔτι κοινωνεῖ τὰ πλασματικὰ διηγήματα τοῖς μύθοις τῷ ἀμφότερα πεπλάσθαι, διαφέρει δὲ καὶ ταῦτα ἀλλήλων, ὅτι τὰ μὲν πλασματικὰ διηγήματα, εἰ καὶ μὴ ἐγένετο, ἀλλ' ἔχει φύσιν γενέσθαι, οἱ δὲ μῦθοι οὔτε ἐγένοντο οὔτε φύσιν ἔχουσι γενέσθαι.

G64c Nicol. ***Prog.*** **3**

...οὐ⟨δὲ⟩ πιστέον τοῖς ἀνασκευάζουσι τὰς χρείας· εἰσὶ γάρ τινες, οἳ καὶ ταύτας καὶ τοὺς μύθους ἀνασκευάζουσι. πρὸς οὓς λεκτέον, ὅτι δεῖ μήτε τὰ ὁμολογούμενα ἀγαθὰ ἀνασκευάζειν διὰ τὸ μηδένα ἔχειν τὸν πειθόμενον μήτε τὰ ὁμολογούμενα ψευδῆ διὰ τὸ πρόδηλον εἶναι τὸ ψεῦδος. οὔτε οὖν τοὺς μύθους οὔτε τὰς χρείας ἀνασκευαστέον· οὔτε γάρ, ὅτι συνεπλάσθησαν οἱ μῦθοι, νοῦν ἔχων τις ἀγνοεῖ οὔτε πεισθήσεταί τις τῷ ἀποτρέποντι τῆς ἀγαθῆς παραινέσεως τῆς κατὰ τὴν χρείαν, καὶ μὴν καὶ ἐν αὐτοῖς τοῖς μύθοις τὸ ἀγαθόν, πρὸς ὃ βλέποντες πλάττομεν τοὺς μύθους, οὐκ ἐᾷ πιθανοὺς εἶναι δοκεῖν τοὺς ἀντιλέγοντας.

Τῶν χρειῶν ἔτι αἳ μὲν δηλοῦσιν, ὁποῖά εἰσι τὰ πράγματα, αἳ δὲ ὁποῖα δεῖ εἶναι. ὁποῖα μέν ἐστιν, ὡς ἐκεῖνο· Αἴσωπος ὁ μυθοποιὸς ἐρωτηθείς, τί ἐστιν ἰσχυρότατον ⟨τῶν⟩ ἐν ἀνθρώποις, εἶπεν· ⟨ὁ⟩ λόγος· τοῦτο γάρ ἐστιν ἰσχυρότατον. ὁποῖα δὲ δεῖ εἶναι, ⟨ὡς⟩ ἐκεῖνο Ἀριστείδης ἐρωτηθείς, τί ἐστι τὸ δίκαιον, εἶπε· τὸ μὴ ἐπιθυμεῖν τῶν ἀλλοτρίων· τοιαῦτα γὰρ δεῖ εἶναι.

G65 Σ *in* Hes. ***Op.*** **202a**

⟨αἶνον:⟩ αἶνος ὁ παροιμιώδης λόγος, ὁ ἐπὶ παραινέσει λεγόμενος·...
[sequitur Hes. 2T17b]

G66a Σ *in* Ar. ***Av.*** **471b**

οὐδ' Αἴσωπον πεπάτηκας VΓ· τὸν λογοποιὸν Αἴσωπον διὰ σπουδῆς εἶχον. ἦν δὲ Αἴσωπος Θρᾷξ. ἠλευθερώθη δὲ ὑπὸ Ἴδμονος τοῦ κωφοῦ, ἐγένετο δὲ πρῶτον Ξάνθου δοῦλος. ὁ δὲ κωμικὸς Πλάτων καὶ ἀναβιῶναί φησιν αὐτὸν ἐν τοῖς Λάκωσιν VMΓMLh οὕτως

καὶ μὴν ὅμοσόν μοι μὴ τεθνάναι, | ψυχὴν δ' ἀνήκειν, ὥσπερ Αἰσώπου ποτέ.

τῶν δὲ μύθων οἱ μὲν περὶ ἀλόγων ζῴων εἰσὶν αἰσώπειοι, οἱ δὲ περὶ ἀνθρώπων συβαριτικοί. VMΓLh
[sequitur Mnesim. G4]

διὰ σπουδῆς δὲ εἶχον τὸν Αἴσωπον. VMΓ
[sequitur Arist. 34T1]

G66b Σ *in* Ar. *Av.* 651b
ὅρα νῦν E ὡς EΓ ἐν Αἰσώπου λόγοις REΓ: ὅτι †σαφῶς† ἀνετίθεσαν Αἰσώπῳ τοὺς λόγους, RVEΓLh...
[sequitur Archil. 4T24]

G67a Σ *in* Ar. *V.* 1182a
πρὸς τὴν συνήθειαν, ὅτι τῶν μύθων προέταττον "οὕτως", οἷον "ἦν οὕτω γέρων καὶ γραῦς". VΓAld καὶ Πλάτων ἐν Φαίδρῳ [237B] φησίν Lh· "ἦν οὕτω δὴ παῖς, μᾶλλον δὲ μειρακίσκος· τούτῳ δ' ἦσαν ἐρασταὶ πάνυ πολλοί". VΓLhAld

G67b Σ *in* Ar. *V.* 1259a
αἰσωπικὸν γέλοιον: μῦθοι οὗτοι ἐγένοντο. VΓAld καὶ VΓAld [ὅτι Lh] οἱ μὲν συβαριτικοὶ VΓAld [αἰσωπικοὶ Lh] μῦθοι Lh περὶ τῶν τετραπόδων VΓAld ἀνθρώπων Lh ἦσαν, οἱ δὲ αἰσωπικοὶ VΓAld [συβαριτικοὶ Lh] περὶ τῶν ἀνθρωπίνων VΓAld [τετραπόδων Lh]. VΓLhAld οὗτοι δὲ οἱ μῦθοι πολιτικοὶ ἦσαν. VΓAld τὸ δὲ "γελοῖον" προείρηται, ὅτι προπερισπωμένως ἐν τοῖς πλείστοις εὕρηται. Lh

G68 Σ *in* *Od.* 14.508
αἶνος μέντοι] αἰνιγματώδης ὁ λόγος ὃν εἶπες. B.
αἶνος] ἔπαινος, ὁ εἰς προτροπῆς περιπέτειαν παραινετικήν.
[sequitur Archil. 4T26]
αἶνος δέ ἐστι καὶ ὁ ὑποβεβλημένος λόγος. M.V.

G69a Hsch. α 2159 Latte
Αἰσώπου γελοῖον· οὕτως ἔλεγον τοὺς Αἰσώπου μύθους. καὶ ἐν τοῖς δικαστηρίοις κοινοῖς ἔστιν ὅτε τοῖς Αἰσωπείοις ἐχρῶντο μύθοις.

G69b Hsch. λ 946 Latte
vide Chamael. G6.

G69c Hsch. μ 1805 Latte
μῦθος· λόγος κενός, ψευδής, εἰκονίζων τὴν ἀλήθειαν. στάσις. ὑπόσχεσις.

G69d Hsch. σ 2131 Schmidt

Συβαριτικοὶ λόγοι· τὸν γὰρ Αἴσωπον ἐν Ἰταλίᾳ γενόμενον σπουδασθῆναι σφόδρα φησίν, ὡς καὶ τὸ τῶν λόγων αὐτοῦ εἶδος ἐπιδαψιλεῦσαι, καὶ Συβαριτικὸν προσαγορευθῆναι. παροιμιώδεις οὖν οἱ Συβαριτικοὶ λόγοι.

G70 Prisc. *Praeex.* 1

Fabula est oratio ficta verisimili dispositione imaginem exhibens veritatis. Ideo autem hanc primam tradere pueris solent oratores, quia animas eorum adhuc molles ad meliores facile vias instituunt. Usi sunt tamen ea vetustissimi quoque auctores, ut ...

[sequuntur Hes. 2T20 Archil. 4T22]

...apud Horatium mus loquitur muri [*S.* 2.6.79-117] *et mustela vulpeculae* [*Ep.* 1.7.29-33], ...

Nominantur autem ab inventoribus fabularum aliae Cypriae, aliae Lybicae, aliae Sybariticae, omnes autem communiter Aesopiae, quoniam in conventibus frequenter solebat Aesopus fabulas uti. Et pertinet ad vitae utilitatem et fit verisimilis, si res quae subiectis accidunt personis apte reddantur: ut puta de pulchritudine aliquis certat, pavo hic supponatur: oportet alicui astutiam tribuere, vulpecula est subicienda: imitatores aliquos hominum volumus ostendere, hic simiis est locus. Oportet igitur modo breviter, modo latius eas disserere. Quomodo autem hoc fiat? si nunc narratione simplici proferantur, nunc etiam sermo inductis fingatur personis, exempli causa:

'Simiae convenerunt et consilium habebant de urbe condenda, et quia placuit illis, paratae erant incipere aedificationem. Sed vetus inter eas prohibuit ab incepto eas docens, quod facile capiantur, si intra muros concludantur'.

Sic breviter dices. Si velis producere, sic:

'Simiae convenerunt, consiliabantur de urbe condenda: quarum una in medium veniens contionata est, quia oportet ipsas quoque civitatem habere. Videtis enim, aiebat, quod civitates habendo homines habent etiam domos singuli et contionem universi, et in theatrum ascendentes delectant animos spectationibus et auditionibus variis'.

Et sic proferes orationem morando, dicens quod et plebiscitum scriptum est, et finges etiam orationem veteris simiae.

Expositio autem fabularum vult circuitionibus carere et iucundior esse. Sed oratio qua utilitas fabulae detegitur, quam epimythion vocant (quam nos affabulationem possumus dicere) a quibusdam prima, sed a plerisque rationabilius postrema ponitur. Sciendum vero, quod etiam oratores inter exempla solent fabulis uti.

G71 Agath. *AP* 16.332

Εὖγε ποιῶν, Λύσιππε γέρων, Σικυώνιε πλάστα,
δείκελον Αἰσώπου στήσαο τοῦ Σαμίου
ἑπτὰ σοφῶν ἔμπροσθεν, ἐπεὶ κεῖνοι μὲν ἀνάγκην
ἔμβαλον, οὐ πειθώ, φθέγμασι τοῖς σφετέροις.
Ὃς δὲ σοφοῖς μύθοις καὶ πλάσμασι καίρια λέξας,
παίζων ἐν σπουδῇ, πείθει ἐχεφρονέειν.
Φευκτὸν δ' ἡ τρηχεῖα παραίνεσις· ἡ Σαμίου δὲ
τὸ γλυκὺ τοῦ μύθου καλὸν ἔχει δέλεαρ.

G72 Olymp. *In Grg.* 49.3

Ἰστέον δὲ ὅτι καὶ τοῦτο οἱ φιλόσοφοι μῦθοι πλέον τῶν ποιητικῶν ἔχουσιν, ὅτι οἱ φιλόσοφοι καὶ ἀποδείξεις ἐν τῷ μέσῳ τῶν μύθων προβάλλουσι, μιμούμενοι τὸ ἐπιμύθιον τῶν Αἰσωπείων μύθων.

G73 anon. *Prol. Phil. Pl.* 2.7

ταῦτα δεῖ ἐν νῷ ἔχειν τοὺς ἐντυγχάνοντας μύθῳ, ἵνα μὴ οἱ παῖδες ἀδικῶνται, ἀλλ' εὐθέως τῷ ἐγκύπτειν αὐτοὺς ἐκ τῶν εἰρημένων μὴ ἀναμείνωσιν δίκην τῶν Αἰσωπείων μύθων τὸ ἐπιμύθιον, ἐξ αὐτοῦ τὸ χρήσιμον τοῦ μύθου μαθεῖν βουλόμενοι, ἀλλ' εὐθέως φανῇ αὐτοῖς τὸ ἐν τούτοις ἀγαθόν. οἱ γὰρ παῖδες, εἰ μὴ τούτοις προσέχωσι, δυσεκνίπτως μέλλουσιν ἔχειν ὃ κακῶς ἤκουσαν.

G74a Rom. *Praef.* 1

rec. gall.

Romulus Tiberino filio! de civitate attica Aesopus quidam, homo graecus et ingeniosus, famulos suos docet, quid homines observare debeant. verum ut vitam hominum et mores ostenderet, inducit aves, arbores, et bestias et pecora loquentes probanda cuislibet fabula<e>. ut noverint homines fabularum cur sit inventum genus, aperte et breviter narravit. apposuit vera malis, composuit integra bonis, scripsit calumnias malorum, argumenta improborum, docens infirmos esse humiles, verba blanda potius cavere et cetera multa et miserias his exemplis scriptis. id ego Romulus transtuli de graeco [sermone] in latinum. si autem legeris, Tiberine fili, et pleno animo advertas, invenies apposita ioca, quae tibi multiplicent risum et acuant satis ingenium.

rec. vet.

Prologus in fabulas Aesopi. Romulus Tiberino filio salutem. de civitate attica Aesopus quidam, homo graecus et ingeniosus, famulos suos docet, quid homines observare debeant. verum ut vitam hominum et mores ostenderet, inducit aves,

arbores, et bestias et pecora loquentes probanda cuiuslibet rei fabula. ut norint homines cur sit inventum genus fabularum, aperte et breviter narravit. apposuit vera malis, composuit integra bonis, scripsit [etiam] calumnias malorum, argumenta inproborum, docens infirmos humiles fore, verbaque blanda potius cavere et cetera multa atque miserias hiis exemplis descriptas. id ego Romulus transtuli de graeco sermone in latinum. si autem legeris, Tiberine fili, et pleno advertas animo, invenies apposita ioca, quae tibi multiplicant risum et acuant satis ingenium.

G74b Rom. *Praef.* 2

rec. gall.

magistro Rufo Aesopus. memoriam tibi tradam, carissime Rufe, meam. membranis habeto scriptam et in candore quo[d] mereris a me, suscipe donum ut pretiosum labium saxis diversi coloris ornatum. iucundam tuam vitam, exspectans seniles annos maturus, amicis semper bonus vivas, uxori luxuriosus vaces, famulis disciplinam ingeras, tuorum vota bene cernas et intentus legas fabulas; et ne forte lector aestimet lapsum me in imprudentiam, invenies in servis tuis esse narrandi vias. nam <et> veteres et paucae olim fuere fabulae. sed, ut maius fieret corpus, adieci et meas novas, aperte et breviter scriptas. apposui vera malis, composui integra bonis. ostendi vias malorum, confirmavi bonorum. sequatur quisque quod libet. per haec omnia docto atque intellegenti parvus non est labor meus, ut norit quisquis fabularum quur sit inventum genus, verum ipsam vitam hominum et mores ostendens instruxi legere volentes.

rec. vet.

memoriam tibi tradam, carissime Rufe, meam. membranis habeo scriptam et in candore, quod mereris a me suscipe donum, ut pretiosum labium saxi diversi coloris ornatum. †iocundam tuam vitam, spectans seniles annos maturos, amicis semper bonus vivas, uxori luxuriosus vaces, famulis disciplinam ingeras, tuorum vota bene cernas et mente intenta legas fabulas. et ne forte lector aestimet me lapsum in imprudentiam, invenies in servis tuis esse narrandi vias. nam et veteres et paucae fabulae olim fuerunt, quarum ut maius foret corpus, adieci et meas novas aperte et breviter scriptas. apposui vera malis, composui integra bonis, ostendi vias malorum, confirmavi bonorum. sequatur quisque quod libeat. per haec omnia docto atque intellegenti parvus non est meus labor, ut norit quisque fabularum genus cur sit inventum. verum ipsam vitam hominum et mores instruxi legere volentes.

G74c Rom. 26a Thiele (2.*Praef.*)

rec. gall.

omne genus fabularum probatur contra homines. quis enim malus nisi homo et quis bonus nisi homo? vitam hominum et mores satis est nobis comprehendere. et tamen

ausus sum breviter similes scribere fabulas. dicam equidem † ex bonorum sive nocentium gesta. [quod ille securus vivat, qui non habet, quem timeat.]

rec. vet.

omne genus fabularum probatur editum esse contra homines? quis enim malus nisi homo et quis bonus nisi homo? vitam hominum et mores satis est nobis comprehendere. et tamen ausus sum breviter similes scribere fabulas. dicam equidem bonorum et innocentium gesta. [quod ille securus vivat, qui non habet quem timeat.]

G75 Isid. *Etym.* 1.40

40 DE FABVLA. Fabulas poetae a fando nominaverunt, quia non sunt res factae, sed tantum loquendo fictae. Quae ideo sunt inductae, ut fictorum mutorum animalium inter se conloquio imago quaedam vitae hominum nosceretur.

[sequitur Alcmaeon Crot. 44T1],

...appellanturque Aesopiae, quia is apud Phrygas in hac re polluit. 2 Sunt autem fabulae aut Aesopicae, aut Libysticae. Aesopicae sunt, cum animalia muta inter se sermocinasse finguntur, vel quae animam non habent, ut urbes, arbores, montes, petrae, flumina. Libysticae autem, dum hominum cum bestiis, aut bestiarum cum hominibus fingitur vocis esse commercium. 3 Fabulas poetae quasdam delectandi causa finxerunt, quasdam ad naturam rerum, nonnullas ad mores hominum interpretati sunt. Delectandi causa fictas, ut eas, quas vulgo dicunt, vel quales Plautus et Terentius conposuerunt. 4 Ad naturam rerum fabulas fingunt, ut "Vulcanus claudus", quia per naturam numquam rectus est ignis, ut illa triformis bestia:

Prima leo, postrema draco, media ipsa Chimaera [Lucr. 5.903]:

id est caprea, aetates hominum per eam volentes distinguere; quarum ferox et horrens prima adolescentia, ut leo; dimidium vitae tempus lucidissimum, ut caprea, eo quod acutissime videat; tunc fit senectus casibus inflexis, draco. 5 Sic et Hippocentauri fabulam esse confictam, id est hominem equo mixtum, ad exprimendam humanae vitae velocitatem, quia equum constat esse velocissimum. 6 Ad mores, ut

apud Horatium mus loquitur muri [*S.* 2.6.79-117]*et mustela vulpeculae* [*Ep.* 1.7.29-33],

ut per narrationem fictam ad id quod agitur verax significatio referatur. Vnde et Aesopi tales sunt fabulae ad morum finem relatae, vel sicut

in libro Iudicum [9.8-15] *ligna sibi regem requirunt et loquuntur ad oleam et ad ficum et ad vitem et ad rubum;*

quod totum utique ad mores fingitur ut ad rem, quae intenditur, ficta quidem narratione, sed veraci significatione veniatur. 7 Sic...

[sequitur D. T 40T7]

FABLES IN ARCHAIC, CLASSICAL, AND HELLENISTIC GREEK LITERATURE

"Trotzdem macht sich weiterhin der Mangel einer Sammlung sämtlicher in antiken Autoren verstreuten Fabeln bemerkbar."
(Adrados 1957, 436)

"...finchè non saranno edite, accanto alle favole anonime, le favole narrate o citate in un contesto letterario (opera che Perry ha sì svolto, ma non integralmente), non esisterà un'edizione propriamente integrale della favolistica esopica." (Jedrkiewicz 1989, 18)

1. *Homerus*

1T1 Theon, *Prog.* 3 (II 73 Spengel)

[praecedit Theon, G20c]

...(Ὅμηρος γὰρ καὶ Ἡσίοδος [2T3a] καὶ Ἀρχίλοχος [4T3] καὶ ἄλλοι τινὲς πρεσβύτεροι γεγονότες αὐτοῦ [sc. Αἰσώπου] φαίνονται ἐπιστάμενοι...)...

[pergit testimonium]

1T2 Ps.-Diogenian. *Praef.* (p. 179 Leutsch-Schneidewin)

[praecedit Call. 20T5]

Εἰκὸς δὲ καταχρηστικώτερον παρ' Ὁμήρῳ αἶνος, ὁ μηδετέρου τούτων μετέχων, ὅτε ἐνδεικνυμένου Ὀδυσσέως χλαίνης ὡς χρῄζει ὁ Εὔμαιός φησιν,

[sequitur Od. 14.508].

[pergit Ps.-Diogenian. G28]

1T3 Philostr. *Im.* 1.3

[praecedit Philostr. G43]

ἐμέλησε μὲν γὰρ καὶ Ὁμήρῳ μύθου καὶ Ἡσιόδῳ [2T10], ἔτι δὲ καὶ Ἀρχιλόχῳ πρὸς Λυκάμβην [4T16],...

[pergit testimonium]

1T4 Jo. Sard. *in Aphth.* (p. 8 Rabe)

[idem atque Hom. 1T1]

1T5 Doxap. *Comm. in Aphth.* (II 165*sq.* Walz)

Αἰσώπειοι δὲ ὡς ἐπίπαν ὀνομάζονται [*sc.* οἱ μῦθοι] οὐχ ὅτι Αἴσωπος πρῶτος εὑρετὴς τῶν μύθων ἐγένετο.

Ὅμηρος γὰρ καὶ Ἡσίοδος [2T27d] καὶ Ἀρχίλοχος [4T32] καὶ ἄλλοι τινές, πρεσβύτεροι γεγονότες αὐτὸν [sc. Αἴσωπον; leg. αὐτοῦ] φαίνονται ἐπιστάμενοι·

ἀλλ' ὅτι Αἴσωπος μᾶλλον κατακόρως καὶ δεξιῶς ἐχρήσατο· ὥσπερ Ἀριστοφάνειόν τι μέτρον καὶ Σαπφικὸν καὶ Ἀλκαϊκόν, οὐχ ὡς τούτων πρώτων ποιητῶν ἢ μόνων ἐξευρόντων τὰ μέτρα, ἀλλ' ὅτι αὐτοῖς ἐπὶ πλεῖστον ἐχρήσαντο.

1T6 Melanchthon, *Util. fab.* (col. 118-119 Bretschneider)

Videmus enim hoc docendi genere [sc. fabularum] usos esse quondam gravissimos et sapientissimos homines, quod nunc quanto malo publico e scholis exulet, non facile dixerim. Homeri Poëtae prudentiam tantopere mirantur eruditi, ut supra communem mortalium sortem vehant, planeque sentiant, divina quadam vi mentem illius percitam fuisse. At is pueris, quos in Graecia passim docebat, bellum ranarum et murium scripsit, ut simul teneros animos lepidissima fabula delectaret, simul doceret quantum praestaret dissimulare quam ulcisci iniuriam, quam sint incerti turbarum ac bellorum omnium exitus, nec raro accidere, ut ab inferioribus potentiores vincantur, saepe malum omne in autoris caput vergere. Nam cum mures nonnulla sane iniuria provocati, armis illam vindicare quam dissimulare mallent, nimiumque suis viribus adversus imbelles ranas fiderent, donarunt superi victoriam imbellioribus, et belli autores pertinaciae suae iustissimas poenas dederunt. Quaeso quid aeque retulit puerilibus animis inseri, atque odium bellorum ac turbarum, tolerantiae studium, et hoc genus alias humanitatis artes?

[sequuntur Hes. 2T43 D. 40T13]

2. *Hesiodus*

2T1 Aristarch. *in* Hes. *Op.* 210-211, fr. 7 Waeschke

vide Aristarch. 59A1.

2T2 Quint. *Inst.* 5.11.19

[praecedit Quint. G18b]

...*(nam uidetur earum* [sc. *fabellarum*] *primus auctor Hesiodus)*...

[pergit testimonium]

2T3a Theon, *Prog.* 3 (II 73 Spengel)

[vide supra Hom. 1T1]

2T3b ib. II 74

[praecedit Theon, G20c]

...Ἡσίοδος·

[sequitur Hes. 2F1.203]·...

[sequitur Hes. 2T3c]

2T3c ibid.

[praecedit Hes. 2T3b]

...· ἐκ μὲν γὰρ τῶν ἐπενεχθέντων,

[sequitur Hes. 2F1.210],

δηλοῦται, ὅτι ἄρα ἤριζεν ἀηδὼν πρὸς ἱέρακα· κἄπειτα ἀγανακτήσας ὁ ἱέραξ καὶ συναρπάσας αὐτὴν οὕτω τάδε εἶπε.

[pergit Theon, G20c]

2T4 Luc. Tarrh. fr. 1 Linnenkugel

[praecedunt Archil. 4T4-5ab]

καὶ Ἡσίοδος

[sequitur Hes. 2F1.202-203 (νοέουσι)].

[pergit Luc. Tarrh. G21]

2T5 Plu. *Mor.* 158

ἀλλ' Ἡσιόδου μὲν ἐμοὶ δοκεῖ δικαιότερον Αἴσωπος αὐτὸν ἀποφαίνειν μαθητὴν ἢ Ἐπιμενίδης· τούτῳ γὰρ ἀρχὴν τῆς καλῆς ταύτης καὶ ποικίλης καὶ πολυγλώσσου σοφίας

ὁ πρὸς τὴν ἀηδόνα λόγος τοῦ ἱέρακος

παρέσχηκεν.

2T6 Herennius Ph. fr. 32 Palmieri

[idem atque Hes. 2T4 (Luc. Tarrh.)]

2T7 Hdn. *Περὶ τῶν εἰς μι* (p. 828 Lentz)

[praecedit Hes. 2T22b (Choer.)]

...ἀεὶ τὴν παράδοσιν γινώσκειν τὸ εἶμι ἐν τοῖς ἑνικοῖς διὰ τῆς ει διφθόγγου, οἷον...καὶ τὸ δεύτερον εἶς, οἷον

[sequitur Hes. 2F1.208]

ἀντὶ τοῦ ἐκεῖ πορεύῃ·...

2T8 Clem. Al. *Strom.* 3.5 (42, 2)

42,1 πῶς δέ ἐστι δυνατὸν ἡττηθέντα τῶν τοῦ σώματος ἡδονῶν ἐξομοιοῦσθαι τῷ κυρίῳ ἢ γνῶσιν ἔχειν θεοῦ; πάσης γὰρ ἡδονῆς ἐπιθυμία κατάρχει, ἐπιθυμία δὲ λύπη τις καὶ φροντὶς δι' ἔνδειαν ὀρεγομένη τινός. 2 ὥστ' οὐκ ἄλλο τί μοι δοκοῦσιν οἱ τοῦτον ἐπανῃρημένοι τὸν τρόπον ἀλλ' ἢ τὸ λεγόμενον δὴ τοῦτο,

[sequitur Hes. 2F1.211 πρός...πάσχειν]

'ἐπίσπαστον' ἑαυτοῖς αἱρούμενοι ἄκακον' νῦν καὶ ἐς ὕστερον.

2T9 Hermog. *Prog.* 1

[praecedit Hermog. G41]

...Ἡσίοδος μὲν τὸν τῆς ἀηδόνος [*sc.* μῦθον] εἰπών,...

[sequitur Archil. 4T15]

2T10 Philostr. *Im.* 1.3
[vide supra Hom. 1T3]

2T11 Jul. *Or.* 7, 207b
[praecedit Jul. G50]
Οὕτω τοι καὶ Ἡσίοδος αὐτὸ φαίνεται πεποιηκώς·...
[sequitur Archil. 4T20]

2T12 Eun. *Hist.* 87
οὕτω γοῦν καὶ ὁ Ἐρεννιανὸς τότε τὸν Ἱέρακα τῷ πολλὰ μὲν ὑφελέσθαι, πλείονα δὲ καταβαλεῖν συλλαβὼν ἀπέδειξε δικαίας ἀποτίνοντα τιμωρίας τοῦ κατὰ Φράβιθον φόνου. ὁ δὲ Ἱέραξ καλούμενος ὑπὸ τοῦ πλείονα καταθέντος ὥσπερ ἀετοῦ συνειλημμένος
ἀηδὼν ἦν Ἡσιόδειος οὐ δυναμένη πρὸς κρείττονα ἀντιφερίζειν.
καὶ αὐτὸς δὲ ὁ ἀετὸς οὐδὲν διέφερεν ἀηδόνος,...

2T13 Macr. 5.16.6
Homerus omnem poesin suam ita sententiis farsit ut singula eius ἀποφθέγματα vice proverbiorum in omnium ore fungantur: ἀλλ' οὔπως ἅμα πάντα θεοὶ δόσαν ἀνθρώποισι [Il. 4.320], χρὴ ξεῖνον παρέοντα φιλεῖν, ἐθέλοντα δὲ πέμπειν [Od. 15.74], μέτρον δ' ἐπὶ πᾶσιν ἄριστον, οἱ πλέονες κακίους [Od. 2.277], δειλαί τοι δειλῶν γε καὶ ἐγγύαι ἐγγυάασθαι [Od. 8.351],
[sequitur Hes. 2F1.210]

2T14 Nicol. *Prog.* 4.3
[laudatur Hes. 2F1.210 (ἐθέλει, κρείσσονα)].
Μουσῶν ἀληθῶς ὁ φιλοσοφῶν Ἡσίοδος ἔφρασε, γνωμολογεῖ γὰρ τὰ θεῶν, καὶ παράγει θεοὺς ἐκ θεῶν, καὶ λαθεῖν οὐκ ἐᾷ, τίς τε ἑκάστου προῆλθε καὶ τίνος, καὶ πολλῶν μέν ἐστιν ἐπαινεῖν τὸν Ἡσίοδον, μάλιστα δέ, ὧν τὸν βίον εἶπεν οἰκονομῶν· νουθετῶν γὰρ ἥττους ὑπείκειν τοῖς κρείττοσιν ἄφρονας ὥρισε τοὺς ἀντεροῦντας τοῖς ὑπερέχουσι· καὶ ἃ μὲν ἔφη τοιάδε· τοῖς δὲ ἐφεξῆς θαυμασθήσεται· λογισάμενος γάρ, ὡς εἰς ἅπαν οἱ χείρους τῶν ἀμεινόνων ἀπολιμπάνονται, συμμάχων, ὅπλων, περιουσίας νεῶν, καὶ ὅσοι ταῖς παρασκευαῖς ἐλαττούμενοι πολεμοῦντες ἡττηθήσονται· καὶ κατηγοροῦνται τῶν ἡττημένων πρὸ τῆς ψυχῆς αἱ γνῶμαι, καὶ ὡς ἀβουλότεροι τῷ πεσεῖν ἐνομίσθησαν· ταῦτα σκοπῶν εἰκότως ἀνουτάτους λέγει τοὺς ἀντεροῦντας τοῖς κρείττοσιν· εἰ δὲ τοῦτο, πῶς ὁ ποιητὴς οὐκ ἔλεγχον τῶν ἡττόνων τὴν τῶν πραγμάτων ἐκέκτητο φύσιν· εἰ μὲν γὰρ τῶν ἀνδρειοτέρων ἦν τὸ κρατεῖν, ἡ νίκη δόξαν ἦγε φρονήσεως, εἰ δὲ τῶν δευτέρων τὸ πίπτειν, τὸ χεῖρον ἄβουλον, οἷς πεσεῖν ἀναγκάζεται· καὶ δι' ἀμφοτέρων ὁ ποιητὴς ἐπαινεῖται γνωμολογῶν, οἷς τε σοφὸν τὸ κρατοῦν, καὶ οἷς φαίνεται τὸ νενικημένον ἀλόγιστον· ὥσπερ δὲ οἱ νῦν κυβερνᾶν κληρωσάμενοι σφοδροτέροις ἀνέμοις μαχόμενοι πίπτουσιν, οὕτω τις ἀντιλέγων τοῖς κρείττοσι τὴν ἴσην ὑποστήσεται βλάβην. Ὅρα Θερσίτην, ὃς ἁπάντων Ἑλλήνων ὑπάρχων καταδεέστερος, ἔριν ποιεῖται πρὸς Ἀγαμέμ-

νονα, καὶ διαλοιδορεῖται τῷ κρατοῦντι τῶν Ἀχαιῶν· ἀνθ' ὧν ὑπέσχε τὴν δίκην ἐξ Ὀδυσσέως πλεῖστα παθών, καὶ περὶ τὴν Τροίαν ἀκηκοὼς ἀκριτόμυθος, ἐκ τῆς ἀνοίας φιλονεικῶν τοῖς ἀμείνοσι· διὸ θαυμάσαι Σοφοκλέα με δεῖ, τοὺς καταδεεῖς φιλοσοφοῦντα παρὰ τῶν δυνατωτέρων κατειργάσθαι. καὶ πεσεῖν μαχόμενον, ἂν μὴ παρῇ παραπλήσιον· οὐ γὰρ ἔστιν, οὐκ ἔστιν ἐπὶ τῆς χείρονος γνώμης ἴσην ἐξενέξκασθαι τύχην, ἀλλὰ τούτων ἀνάγκη μετὰ τῆς ἰσχύος ἐκλείπειν τὴν διάνοιαν· πῶς οὖν οὐκ ἄν τις μᾶλλον ἑτέρων ἐπαινέσῃ ποιητῶν τὸν Ἡσίοδον, ὃς ἄφρονας ἔφη τοὺς τοῖς κρείττοσιν ἀντιπράττοντας.

2T15 Stob. 3.4.3

Ἡσιόδου·

[sequitur Hes. 2F1.210-211]

2T16 Σ *in* E. *Hec.* 678

† ζῶσαν λέλακας· τὸ λέλακας ἐπὶ ὄρνιθος μόνον λαμβάνεται, ὡς καὶ Ἡσίοδός φησι

[sequitur Hes. 2F1.207 δαιμονίη...λέληκας]

περὶ ἀηδόνος λέγων.

2T17a Σ (Procl. ?) *in* Hes. *Op.* 202-206

νῦν δ' αἶνον βασιλεῦσιν· ὁ μὲν κατὰ τὴν Πανδώραν μῦθος, τὴν αἰτίαν τῶν ἐν ἀνθρώποις κακῶν, εἰς τὸ θῆλυ τῆς ψυχῆς ἀνέφερεν καὶ τὴν ἄλογον ζωὴν ἐκ τῶν οὐρανίων ἡμῖν προσπλασθεῖσαν. ὁ δὲ περὶ τῶν γενῶν λόγος δεύτερος ⟨εἰς⟩ τὰς παντοίας μεταβολὰς τῶν ἀνθρωπίνων ζῴων τὰς διὰ τὴν ἀναλογίαν ἐπεισελθούσας ζώντων ἡμῶν, τοτὲ μὲν κατὰ λόγον, τοτὲ δὲ κατὰ τὸ ἄλογον. ὁ δὲ αἶνος οὗτος τρίτος, παραίνεσίς τις ὢν καὶ νουθέτησις ἐπικεκαλυμμένη πρὸς τοὺς κατὰ πάθος ζῶντας, ἔνδειξίς ἐστι τῆς βιαίου καὶ πλεονεκτικῆς ζωῆς καὶ θηριώδους κατὰ τῶν βιασθῆναι μὲν δυναμένων, ὅμως δὲ ἱεροπρεπεστέρων ὄντων. καὶ ὁ μέν γε ἱέραξ ἁρπακτικόν, ἡ δὲ ἀηδὼν μουσικόν. παιδευτικὸς οὖν ὁ λόγος δεικνὺς οὗ μὲν οἱ δωροφάγοι τεταγμένοι τυγχάνουσιν, οὗ δὲ οἱ Μουσῶν θεραπευταί, καὶ τίνες οἱ ἄδικοι, τίνες δὲ οἱ θεοῖς φίλοι διὰ τούτων τῶν εἰκόνων. καὶ γὰρ ἱέραξ φέρει τὴν ἀηδόνα μεμαρπὼς καὶ τοῖς ὄνυξιν εἰς αὐτὴν ἐμπεπηγόσι κατέχων, ἡ δὲ ἔχεται καὶ πάσχει ὑπὸ τοῦ δυνατωτέρου κακῶς. ἐλεὸν γάρ φησι·

[laudatur Hes. 2F1.205 γναμπτοῖσι-206 μύρετο (ὀνύχεσσι)]

τούτεστιν ἐλεεινὸν ὠδύρετο. [τὸ γὰρ ἐλεὸν ὀξυτόνως σημαίνει τὸ ἐλεεινόν]. ὑπὸ τῶν ὀνύχων κατεχομένη φωνὴν ἀφίησιν ἐλεεινήν, ὡς οἱ ἀδικούμενοι ὑπὸ τῶν βασιλέων καὶ βιαζόμενοι πλέον οὐδὲν ἔχοντες τῶν ὀδυρμῶν.

2T17b ib. 202a

[praecedit Σ *in* Hes. G65]

... ὥσπερ γὰρ ἡ ἀηδὼν ἐν τοῖς ποσὶ τοῦ ἱέρακος, οὕτω κἀγὼ ἐν ταῖς χερσὶν

ὑμῶν. καλῶς οὖν ἑαυτὸν ἀηδόνι ἀπῄκασεᾳμουσικὸν γὰρ τὸ ὄρνεον—καὶ τοὺς κριτὰς ἱέρακι—ἁρπακτικὸν γὰρ τὸ ζῷον.

2T17c ib. 205a
ἐλεόν· ὀξυτόνως ἀντὶ τοῦ ἐλεεινόν· μύρετο δὲ ἀντὶ τοῦ ἐθρήνει ἢ ὠδύρετο.

2T17d ibid. b
⟨γναμπτοῖσι·⟩ ἐπικαμπέσι.

2T17e ib. 207-212
⟨δαιμονίη, τί λέληκας;·⟩ ταῦτα καὶ τὰ ἑξῆς ὁ τῶν ἁρπακτικῶν λέγει νόμος, οἷον καὶ Θρασύμαχος ἐτίθει καὶ πᾶς ὁ τοιοῦτος, εἴτε Φάλαρις εἴτε Ἀπολλόδωρος, ἰκτίνοις ἐοικότες καὶ λύκοις καὶ ἄλλοις τοιούτοις, καὶ ὑπὸ τοῦ χείρονος, δυνατωτέρου δέ, τὸ⟨ν⟩ ἀσθενέστερον, κἂν κρείττων ᾖ, πάσχειν κακῶς καὶ ἐπιτωθάζειν τὸν ποιοῦντα τῷ πάσχοντι. τὸ γὰρ

[laudatur Hes. 2F1.208 -ἄγω]

δηλοῖ τὸν μὲν βιαιότερον ἄγειν, ἄγεσθαι δὲ ὅπου ἂν ἐκείνῳ δοκῇ τὸν ἀσθενέστερον. πρόσκειται δὲ καὶ τὸ ἀοιδόν [περ] ἐοῦσαν [208], διὰ τὸ ἄγεσθαι τὸν Ἡσίοδον ἐνδεικνύμενον τὸν ἱερὸν τῶν Μουσῶν ἀναγκάζεσθαι τοῖς βασιλεῦσιν ἀδικοῦσιν εἴκειν· ἐπ' ἐκείνοις γὰρ εἶναι καὶ δεῖπνον αὐτὸν ποιήσασθαι ἢ μεθεῖναι, καθάπερ ἐπὶ τῷ ἱέρακι τὴν ἀηδόνα. καὶ τέλος ἐπήγαγεν ὅτι ἄφρονος ἔργον ἐστὶν ἀντιβαίνει τοῖς ἰσχυροτέροις, ὡς ἂν οὐδὲ αὐτὸς ἐναντιωσόμενος τοῖς ἄρχουσι βιαζομένοις. διπλοῦν γὰρ εἶναι τὸ ἐκ τῆς πρὸς τοὺς δυνατωτέρους ἀντιβάσεως κακόν· τό τε ἐκ τῆς ἥττης ὄνειδος, ὅπερ ἐκάλεσεν αἶσχος, καὶ τὴν ἐπὶ τῷ κρατηθῆναι λύπην, ἣν εἶπε πάθος ἀλγεινόν.

[sequitur Hes. 2T1]

2T17f ib. 207a
⟨δαιμονίη·⟩ δαιμονίην τὴν ἀηδόνα φησὶ διὰ τὸ μουσικὸν καὶ ἱερόν.

2T17g ibid. b
λέληκας· δηλοῖ τὸ βεβόηκας.

2T17h ibid. c
⟨ἔχει νύ σε πολλὸν ἀρείων·⟩ ὡς ἂν ⟨τοιοῦτοι⟩ οἱ λόγοι εἶεν βασιλέων πρὸς τοὺς ἡττωμένους· διδάσκει οὖν αὐτοῖς μηκέτι ταῦτα λέγειν.

2T17i ibid. d
ἀρείων· ὁ δυνατώτερος εἴρηται.

2T17j ib. 210a
⟨ἀντιφερίζειν·⟩ ἀντιβαίνειν, ἐξισοῦσθαι.

2T17k ib. 212a
⟨τανυσίπτερος·⟩ ὁ ἁπλῶν τὰς πτέρυγας.

2T17l ib. 213a
σὺ δ' ἄκουε δίκης· πρὸς ἀντιδιαστολήν φησι τῶν ἀλόγων ζῴων· σὺ λογικὸς ὢν καὶ λόγοις καὶ νόμοις πολιτευόμενος ἄκουε δίκης, μὴ δ' αὔξανε τὴν ὕβριν καθάπερ τὰ ἄλογα ζῷα· τούτοις γὰρ ἴδιον τὸ ἀδικεῖν μὴ νόμῳ κυβερνωμένοις, ἀνθρώποις δὲ τὸ δικαιοπραγεῖν καὶ νόμοις ὑπείκειν καὶ πείθεσθαι.

2T18 Σ *in* Il. 19.407
[praecedit Σ *in* Il. G36]
...Ἡσίοδος ἐπὶ τοῦ ἱέρακος,...
[sequitur Archil. 4T26]

2T19 *Hypoth.* Isoc. 1
Ἀνάγονται δὲ αἱ παραινέσεις ὑπὸ τὸ συμβουλευτικὸν εἶδος, κέκληνται δὲ παραινέσεις παρὰ τὸν αἶνον, ὅ ἐστι τὴν συμβουλήν, ὡς καὶ Ἡσίοδος·
[sequitur Hes. 2F1.202 νῦν...βασιλεῦσι]·
στάσιν δὲ οὐκ ἐπιδέχονται· οὐ γὰρ ἔχουσι τὸν ἀντιλέγοντα.

2T20 Prisc. *Praeex.* 1
[praecedit Prisc. G70]
...*Hesiodus Archilochus Horatius, Hesiodus quidem lusciniae,...*
[sequitur Archil. 4T22]

2T21 Men. Prot. *Exc. de sent.* fr. 35a Müller
"Οτι περὶ Προκοπίου τοῦ ἱστορικοῦ καὶ δικηγόρου φησὶν ὁ Μένανδρος· "Οὐ γὰρ ἐμοί γε δυνατόν, οὐδὲ γε ἄλλως πέφυκε θυμῆρες, τοσαύτῃ λόγων ἀκτῖνι τὴν ἐμαυτοῦ θρυαλλίδα ἀντανασχεῖν. Ἀρκέσει δέ μοι ἐν μικροῖς πάγκαλον δεῖσθαι τοῖς ἐμαυτοῦ, καὶ τῷ Ἀσκραίῳ [ἕπεσθαι] ποιητῇ
ἠλίθιόν τινα καὶ παράφρονα εἶναι φάσκοντα τὸν ἐς τοὺς κρείττονας ἁμιλλώμενον."

2T22a Choer. *in* Theod. (p. 27 Hilgard)
Τὸ δὲ εἴς τὸ σημαῖνον τὸ ὑπάρχεις καὶ τὸ εἶς τὸ σημαῖνον τὸ πορεύῃ ἀπὸ τοῦ πρώτου προσώπου ἔχει τὴν ει δίφθογγον·
(...)
...κατὰ τροπὴν τῆς μι εἰς ς τὸ δεύτερον ποιεῖ πρόσωπον εἶς,
[seq. Hes. 2F1.208]
ἀντὶ τοῦ πορεύῃ· καὶ λοιπὸν ἐκεῖθεν ἔσχε τὴν ει δίφθογγον.

2T22b ib. 326
φησὶ γὰρ ὁ 'Ηρωδιανός,
[sequitur Hes. 2T7 (Hdn.)]

2T22c ib. 328
Ἰστέον ὅτι τὰ εἰς μι λήγοντα τροπῇ τῆς μι εἰς ς τὸ δεύτερον πρόσωπον ποιοῦσιν, οἷον...εἶμι εἶς περισπωμένως, ὡς παρ' 'Ησιόδῳ
[sequitur Hes. 2F1.208]
ἀντὶ τοῦ ἐκεῖ πορεύῃ·...

2T22d ib. 332
τὸ γὰρ εἴς τὸ σημαῖνον τὸ ὑπάρχεις...καὶ τὸ εἶς τὸ σημαῖνον τὸ πορεύῃ, ὡς παρ' 'Ησιόδῳ
[sequitur Hes. 2F1.208]
ἀντὶ τοῦ πορεύῃ, ἀπὸ τῶν ἰδίων πρωτοτύπων ἔχουσι τὴν ει δίφθογγον.

2T23a *Et. Gen.* α 215 Lasserre-Livadaras
αἶνος·
[sequitur Hes. 2F1.202 (φρονέουσι)]
γέγονε δὲ παρὰ τὸ ἰαίνω, τὸ τέρπω, (***) διαχέω, ἴαινος, ὁ διαχέων τὴν ψυχήν, καὶ ἀφαιρέσει τοῦ ι, ὡ(ς) †ἴηος ἧος† γέγονεν ἴαινος αἶνος, ὁ ἔπαινος, προπερισπώμενον καὶ ῥῆμα ἐξ αὐτοῦ αἰνῶ παρὰ τὸ ἰαίνω, τὸ διαχέω.

2T23b ib. 926
ἀντιφερίζω· τὸ ἐναντιοῦμαι ἢ ἐξισοῦμαι· παρὰ τὸ φέρω φερίζω, ὡς θέρω θερίζω, οἷον·
[sequitur Hes. 2F1, 210]·
ἀμφότερον·
[sequitur Hes. 2F1, 211]·
καὶ τῆς νίκης στερεῖται καὶ πρὸς τῇ αἰσχύνῃ ἄλγεα πάσχει. 'Ησίοδος. καὶ ἀντιφέρεσθαι, ἐναντιοῦσθαι.

2T24 *Epim. in* Hom. (p. 238 Cramer)
Κουλεός [Il. A 220]· Τὸ λε ψιλόν· τὰ διὰ τοῦ εος ὀξύτονα μονογενῆ, διὰ τοῦ ε γράφονται· οἷον, ἐλέος, σημαίνει δὲ τὸν ἐλεεινόν,
[sequitur Hes. 2F1.205 ἡ...πεπαρμένη]
γίνεται ἐκ τοῦ κοῖλον κοιλέος, καὶ τροπῇ τοῦ ι εἰς υ, κουλέος, τὸ κοῖλον καὶ βαθύτατον.

2T25 Jo. Sard. *in Aphth.* (p. 8 Rabe)
[vide Hom. 1T4 (pro Αἰόλος (sic Rabe) 'Ησίοδος leg. conieci)]

2T26 ***Suda*****, αι 230 Adler**

Αἶνος· λόγος παροιμιώδης. ἢ ἔπαινος, καὶ ἐγκώμιον. αἶνός τίς ἐστιν· ὡς ἀνήρ τε καὶ οὐκ ἀνήρ, ὄρνιθα κοὐκ ὄρνιθα, ὄρνιθα δ' ὅμως, ἐπὶ ξύλου με κοὐ ξύλου καθημένην, λίθῳ τε κοὐ λίθῳ με βαλὼν διώλεσεν. εὐνοῦχος, νυκτερίς, νάρθηξ, κίσσηρις. αἶνος διαφέρει μύθου τῷ τὸν αἶνον μὴ πρὸς παῖδας, ἀλλὰ πρὸς ἄνδρας πεποιῆσθαι καὶ μὴ πρὸς ψυχαγωγίαν μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ παραίνεσιν ἔχειν τινά. βούλεται γὰρ ἐπικρυπτόμενος παραινεῖν τι καὶ διδάσκειν· ὅπερ καὶ Ἡσίοδος φαίνεται πεποιηκώς.

2T27a Doxap. ***Comm. in Aphth.*** **(II 143 Walz)**

Τινὲς δὲ καὶ αἶνον αὐτὸν [sc. τὸν μῦθον] ὠνόμασαν ἀπὸ τῆς ἐν αὐτῷ παραινέσεως, ὡς Ἡσίοδος ἐν τῷ περὶ τῶν ἔργων καὶ ἡμερῶν βιβλίῳ λέγων·

[sequitur Hes. 2F1.202]

ἔνιοι δὲ καὶ λόγον αὐτὸν ὀνόμαζουσι· διὸ καὶ ὁ Αἴσωπος λογοποιὸς λέγεται, μύθων γὰρ πλάστης ὁ Αἴσωπος.

2T27b ib. 144

Ἔτι κἀκεῖνο προεγράφη, πόθεν παρωνόμασται μῦθος, ὅτι ἀπὸ τοῦ μυθεῖσθαι· ἐν μόνῳ γὰρ τὸ λέγεσθαι ἔχει τὴν ὑπόστασιν. εἰ γὰρ καὶ ὁ ἀληθὴς οὕτως ὠνόμασται, ἀλλὰ καὶ διὰ τῶν πραγμάτων βεβαιούμενος, εἰκότως καὶ ἑτέρωθεν ὠνόμασται, ἢ καὶ ὅτι πολλῶν ὄντων τῶν λόγων τῶν λεγομένων μόνος ὁ κατὰ φύσιν ψευδὴς ἀπὸ τοῦ μυθεῖσθαι παρωνόμασται, ὥσπερ καὶ πολλῶν οὐσῶν βοτανῶν τῶν εἰς τὸ ἄνω θεουσῶν, μόνον τὸ ἄνηθον παρὰ τὸ ἄνω θεῖν καθ' Ὠρίωνα παρωνόμασται· καλεῖται δὲ καὶ αἶνος, ὡς Ἡσίοδος ἐν τῷ περὶ τῶν ἔργων καὶ ἡμερῶν βιβλίῳ λέγει,

[sequitur Hes. 2F1.202]

ἔνιοι δὲ καὶ λόγον αὐτὸν ὀνόμαζουσι, ἐπεὶ καὶ ὁ Αἴσωπος λογοποιὸς λέγεται, μύθων γὰρ πλάστης ὁ Αἴσωπος.

2T27c ib. 149

Γεγένηται δὲ καὶ ῥητόρων κοινός.—Κοινωνίαν τινὰ καὶ διαφορὰν τῶν ποιητῶν καὶ ῥητόρων ἐνταῦθα ἐσήμανεν· ἐν μὲν γὰρ τῷ εἰπεῖν, ὅτι γεγένηται δὲ καὶ ῥητόρων κοινός, τὴν κοινωνίαν ἐδήλωσεν· ἐν δὲ τῷ εἰπεῖν ἐκ παραινέσεως, τὴν διαφοράν· ἔδειξε γὰρ ὅτι εἰ καὶ κοινός ἐστι τῶν τε ποιητῶν καὶ ῥητόρων ὁ μῦθος, ὅμως οὐ διὰ τὴν αὐτὴν αἰτίαν αὐτῷ χρῶνται οἵ τε ποιηταὶ καὶ οἱ ῥήτορες· οἱ μὲν γὰρ ῥήτορες διὰ παραίνεσιν, οἱ δὲ ποιηταὶ ὡς ἐπὶ τὸ πλεῖστον διὰ τὸ μόνην ψυχαγωγίαν ἐμποιεῖν. Ὡς ἐπὶ τὸ πλεῖστον δὲ εἶπον, διότι ἔσθ' ὅτε καὶ οἱ ποιηταὶ πρὸς παραίνεσιν αὐτῷ χρῶνται, ὡς

ὁ τῆς ἀηδόνος
ἔχει παρὰ τῷ Ἡσιόδῳ.

2T27d ib. 166

[vide Hom. 1T5]

2T28 Σ *in Aphth.* 1.11 (Π 570 Walz)
Τὸν μῦθόν τινες καὶ αἶνον ἐκάλεσαν ἀπὸ τῆς ἐν αὐτῷ παραινέσεως, ὡς Ἡσίοδος·
[sequitur Hes. 2F1.202 νῦν...ἐρέω]

2T29a Eust. *Il.* A 80
[ὁ δὲ τοιοῦτος κρείσσων, οὗ καὶ ῥῆμα τὸ κρεισσῶ παραδιδόασιν οἱ παλαιοί, λέγοιτ' ἂν μάλα καιρίως καὶ ἀρείων παρὰ τὸ Ἄρης κατὰ τὸ
[sequitur Hes. 2F1.207 τί...ἀρείων]

2T29b ibid. 113
ὥσπερ δὲ μέλω μελήσω μεμέληκα καὶ μέσος παρακείμενος μέμηλα, καὶ ὤλεκα ὦλα, τεθάληκα τέθηλα, οὕτω βεβούληκα βέβουλα. τοιοῦτόν τι καὶ τὸ λέληκα.
[sequitur Hes. 2T1.207 δαιμονίη...λέληκας;]
καὶ τὸ δεδούπηκα, δέδουπα, κατὰ Ἡρωδιανόν—"δεδουπότος Οἰδιπόδαο" [Il. Ψ 679]—καὶ ἕτερα οὐκ ὀλίγα, ἐν οἷς καὶ τὸ ἐκτύπηκα, ἔκτυπα.

2T29c ib. Λ 430
Τὸ δὲ "πολύαινε" ἢ ἐπὶ ἐπαίνῳ εἴρηται—πιστὸς δὲ ὁ ἐκ τῶν πολεμίων ἔπαινος, εἰ μή που πρὸς εἰρωνίαν λαλεῖται,—ἢ ἀντὶ τοῦ στωμύλε, μυθολόγε. Αἶνος γὰρ ἔστιν οὗ καὶ ὁ μυθώδης λόγος, ὡς καὶ παρ' Ἡσιόδῳ
[sequitur Hes. 2F1.202, αἶνον...ἐρέω],
ἤτοι μυθώδη παραίνεσιν.
[sequuntur Archil. 4T35 Hes. 2T29d Call. 20T13]

2T29d ibid.
[praecedit Archil. 4T35 (Eust.)]
...καὶ Ἡσίοδος
[sequitur Hes. 2F1.202-203, νῦν...ἐρέω, ὧδ'...ἀηδόνα],...
[sequitur Call. 20T13]

2T29e ib. Σ 505
ὅτι δὲ βασιλεῖς καὶ οἱ δικασταί, δηλοῖ καὶ Ἡσίοδος ἐν τῷ
[sequitur Hes. 2F1.202 ὧδ'...ἐρέω].

2T29f ib. Ψ 795
Σημείωσαι δὲ καὶ ὅτι αἶνον οἱ παλαιοὶ τὸν ἀπόκρυφον λόγον καὶ ἐσχηματισμένον λέγοντες καὶ ὡς οἷον εἰπεῖν αἰανὸν διὰ τὸ βάθος, ὡς τὸ
[sequitur Hes. 2F1.202, νῦν...ἐρέω]
καὶ ὅσα τοιαῦτα, ὅθεν καὶ τὸ αἰνίζομαι ἐπὶ αἰνίγματος, οὐκ ἂν ἔχοιεν τὸν τοιοῦτον νοῦν συμβιβάζειν καὶ ἐπὶ τοῦ ἐνταῦθα κειμένου αἴνου. νῦν γὰρ φανερῶς αἶνος ὁ ἔπαινος, εἰ μὴ ἄρα καὶ αὐτὸς αἶνος λέγεται διὰ τὸ βάθος ἔχειν.

2T30a Eust. *Od.* α 398

Σημείωσαι δὲ ὅτι οὐ μόνον Ὅμηρος βασιλεῖς λέγει τοὺς ἐνδόξους καὶ βασιλικούς, ἀλλὰ καὶ οἱ μετ' αὐτόν. παρὰ Σοφοκλεῖ [*OT* 911] γοῦν ἡ Ἰοκάστη τοὺς ἐν Θηβαῖς εὐγενεῖς, χώρας ἄνακτας λέγει. καὶ Ἡσίοδος δὲ τοὺς δικαστάς, βασιλεῖς λέγει ἐν τῷ,

[sequitur Hes. 2F1.202 αἶνον...ἐρέω (βασιλεῦσιν)]

2T30b ib. μ 85

Τὸ δὲ λελακυῖα ἔχει μὲν ὁριστικὸν παρακείμενον καὶ διὰ τοῦ ηῳ. λέληκε γάρ, ὡς τὸ

[sequitur Hes. 2F1.206 δαιμονίη...λέληκας;]

δηλοῖ δὲ φωνὴν ἄναρθρον, καθὰ καὶ τὸ λακεῖν, ὡς τὸ ὄστεα ἔλακεν, ἤτοι ποιὸν ἀπετέλεσαν ἦχον θραυσθέντα, εἰ καὶ ὁ κωμικὸς παίζων τραγικώτερος ἐπὶ φωνῆς ἐνάρθρου τὸ ῥῆμα τέθεικεν ἐν τῷ, τί δῆτα ὁ Φοῖβος ἔλακεν.

2T30c ib. ξ 508

Ὅτι δέ, ὡς ἐρρέθη, τὴν τοῦ αἴνου ἀξίωσιν κεκρύφθαι δεῖ καὶ μὴ ἐκφωνεῖσθαι πρὸς λογίους μέντοι ἀκροατάς, δηλοῖ καὶ Ἡσίοδος, ὃς τῷ παρ' αὐτοῦ πλασθέντι αἴνῳ τῆς ἀηδόνος οὐ προσέθετο τὴν ἀξίωσιν, ἥ τις ἦν, τὸ μὴ δεῖν εἶναι θηριωδῶς τοὺς ἅρπαγας ἐπιφύεσθαι τῷ μουσολήπτῳ ἐκείνῳ ἀοιδῷ, ἀλλὰ σεσίγηκεν, ἀφεὶς νοεῖν ἐκεῖθεν τοὺς ἀκροατὰς ὡς λογίους.

[sequitur Hes. 2F1.202 αἶνον γάρ, φησίν, ἐρέω βασιλεῦσι φρονεοῦσι καὶ αὐτοῖς]

τουτέστι δυναμένοις νοεῖν ὅ περ αἰνίξομαι. Δῆλον δὲ ὅτι αἶνος παρὰ τοῖς παλαιοῖς οὐ μόνον ἔπαινος, ἐξ οὗ πολύαινος Ὀδυσσεύς, ὡς αἱ Σειρῆνες εἶπον, ἀλλὰ καὶ λόγος συμβολικὸς ἐκ μύθου ἢ ἱστορίας περιπέτειαν ἔχων παραινετικήν, ῥητῶς δὲ κατὰ τὸν παλαιὸν εἰπεῖν, λόγος μυθικὸς ἐκφερόμενος ἀπὸ ἀλόγων ζῴων ἢ φυτῶν πρὸς ἀνθρώπων παραίνεσιν, ὡς εἰρήσεται. διὸ καὶ Ἡσίοδος τὸν περὶ τῆς ἀηδόνος παρ' αὐτῷ λόγον αἶνον, ὡς ἐρρέθη, ἐκάλεσε,...

[sequuntur Archil. 4T36-37ab Call. 20T14]

2T31a Tz. *in* Hes. *Op.* 200

ΝΥΝ Δ' ΑΙΝΟΝ. Μυθικὴν παραίνεσιν. Εἰκάζει δὲ ὁ ποιητὴς ἑαυτὸν ἀηδόνι, διὰ τὸ τῆς ποιητικῆς ᾠδικόν· τοὺς δὲ κριτὰς ἱέρακι, διὰ τὸ ἁρπακτικόν. Γνωστὸν δὲ τοῦτο πᾶσι, καὶ οὐ δεῖ ἐνταῦθα Προκλικῶν ματαίων πλασμάτων· ἐν γὰρ τοῖς σπουδαίοις ὁ Πρόκλος οὐδὲν γράφων, ἐν τοῖς τοιούτοις μεγαλήγορος, καὶ μακρότερα γράφειν τῆς Ἰλιάδος οὐκ ἀπαναίνεται. Ἡμεῖς δὲ ταῦτα παρέντες τὰ δεόμενα ἐξηγήσεως λέξομεν· καὶ πρῶτα ταύτην τὴν σύνταξιν καίπερ κακῶς ἔχουσαν.

Νῦν δ' αἶνον βασιλεῦσ' ἐρέω ὧδε, τουτέστι μυθικῶς, φρονέουσι καὶ αὐτοῖς· εἶτα ἄρχεται τοῦ μύθου·

[laudatur Hes. 2F1.203-207]

τῇδε καὶ ἐνταῦθα εἴσι καὶ εἴσιθι καὶ πορεύου, ὅπου σε ἂν ἐγὼ ἄγω·

[laudatur Hes. 2F1.209]

Μέχρι τοῦδε ὡς ἀπὸ τῶν ὀρνέων ὁ ποιητὴς τοὺς λόγους ποιεῖται. Ἐντεῦθεν δὲ ἀναλαμβάνει τὸ ἴδιον πρόσωπον, καὶ λέγει τὸ ἐπιμύθιον, τοῦτο τὸ δίστιχον τοῖς κριταῖς, τὸ,

[laudatur Hes. 2F1.210]

καὶ τὸν ἕτερον στίχον· εἶτα πρὸς τὸν Πέρσην ἀποστρέψας τὸν λόγον, φησὶ τὸ,

[laudatur Hes. 2F1.212 -ἴρηξ].

[sequitur Aristarch. 59T2]

Οἷον τὸ ΠΟΙΚΙΛΟΔΕΙΡΟΝ, τὴν ποικιλόφωνον λέγει, ἢ τὴν ἐστιγμένην καὶ ποικίλην ἔχουσαν τὴν δειρήν, ἤγουν τὸν τράχηλον.

2T31b ib. 209

ΝΙΚΗΣ ΤΕ ΣΤΕΡΕΤΑΙ, ΠΡΟΣ Τ' ΑΙΣΧΕΣΙΝ. Αἶσχος φησὶ προσγίνεσθαι ἐκ πληγῶν ἢ ὕβρεων πρὸς τῷ ἡττηθῆναι τοῖς ἥττοσι συμβάλλουσιν ἔριν μετὰ κρειττόνων. Ὁ δὲ Πρόκλος λεγέτω ὅσα καὶ βούλεται. ΩΣ ΕΦΑΤ' ΩΚΥΠΕΤΗΣ ΙΡΗΞ [Hes. 2F1.212]· ἐπιλογιστικὸν τὸ σχῆμα καὶ ἀνακεφαλαιωτικόν· ΙΡΗΞ, ψιλωτέον. Ἐκ τοῦ ἴω γάρ, τὸ πορεύομαι. Καὶ Ὅμηρος, Αὐτὸς δ' ὥς τ' ἴρηξ [Il. N 62]. Ἀττικῶς δὲ δασύνεται, ἐκ τοῦ ἵημι, τὸ πέμπω.

2T31c ib. 210

ΤΑΝΥΣΙΠΤΕΡΟΣ. Ὁ λίαν τανύων τὰ πτερά, ταχύς, ὡς τὸ ΔΟΜΟΙΣΙ ΠΟΙΗΤΟΙΣΙ [cf. Il. E 198, Οδ. ν 306], τοῖς λίαν καὶ καλῶς πεποιημένοις.

2T31d ib. 211

ΣΥ Δ' ΑΚΟΥΕ ΔΙΚΗΣ. Τὴν ἔκθεσιν τοῦ μύθου ἐπαγάγων, καὶ δείξας ὅτι ὑπὸ τῶν σθεναρῶν καταβλάπτονται οἱ ἀσθενεῖς ἀδίκως, ἀποστρέφει τὸν λόγον πρὸς τὸν Πέρσην, καί φησι· σὺ δὲ πειθόμενος ἔσο δικαιοσύνῃ καὶ κρίσεσι, μὴ δὲ ἄνευ δίκης, καθάπερ οἱ ἀλαζόνες καὶ ἄδικοι, ὄφελλε καὶ αὔξανε τὴν ὕβριν καὶ βλάβην καὶ ἀδικίαν.

2T32a anon. gramm. (*An. Ox.* p. 171)

τούτου τὸ β' εἶς, ἀντὶ τοῦ πορεύει, ὡς τὸ

[sequitur Hes. 2F1.208 τῇ...ἄγω]

2T32b ib. 201

εἶμι τὸ πορεύομαι, εἶς τὸ πορεύῃ, ὡς παρ' Ἡσιόδῳ

[sequitur Hes. 2F1.208 τῆς [sic]...εἶς]

2T32c ib. 209

ἐξ οὗ τὸ εἶς ἀντὶ τοῦ πορεύῃ, τὸ δεύτερον πρόσωπον· ὡς τὸ

[sequitur Hes. 2F1.208 τῇδε...παράγω]

ἀντὶ τοῦ πορεύῃ.

2T33 ***Et. Gud. s.v.*** **αἶνος (p. 48.19-21 De Stefani)**

[praecedunt Archil. 4T33a, 4T34]

..., καὶ Ἡσίοδος

[sequitur Hes. 2F1.202-203 (ν⟦ο⟧έουσι)]:...

[sequitur Call. 20T12]

2T34 Greg. Cor. ***Dial.*** **66 (p. 475 Schaefer)**

66 Ἡ κρᾶσις τοῦ ι καὶ ε εἰς ι μακρὸν τῶν Ἰώνων ἐστίν. ἱερεὺς ἱρεύς, ἱέραξ ἵραξ, καὶ τροπῇ τοῦ α εἰς ἵρηξ, κατὰ τὴν αὐτὴν διάλεκτον. Ἡσίοδος·

[sequitur Hes. 2F1.203]

καὶ ὄφιες ὄφις Ἰωνικόν.

2T35a ***EM*** **α 513 Lasserre-Livadaras**

αἶνος·

[sequitur Hes. 2F1.202]

παρὰ τὸ ἰαίνω, τὸ τέρπω καὶ εὐφραίνω καὶ διαχέω, ἴαινος, ὁ διαχέων τὴν ψυχήν, καὶ ἀφαιρέσει τοῦ ι, ὡς ἰήϊος ἤϊος γέγονεν αἶνος, ὁ ἔπαινος, καὶ ῥῆμα ἐξ αὐτοῦ αἰνῶ παρὰ τὸ ἰαίνω, οἷον· ἰαίνετο δὲ φρένας εἴσω [A.R. 3.1019], καὶ τοῖσιν ἰάνθη θυμός [Il. Ψ 597]. ἔστι δὲ καὶ Αἶνος πόλις Θρᾴκης.

2T35b ib. 1463

Ἀντιφερίζω· Παρὰ τὸ φέρω φερίζω, ὡς θέρω θερίζω, καὶ ἀντιφερίζω, τὸ ἐναντιοῦμαι, ἢ ἐξισοῦμαι. Ἡσίοδος,

[sequitur Hes. 2F1.210]

Καὶ ἀντιφέρεσθαι, τὸ ἐναντιοῦσθαι· οἱ δέ, ἀντιλέγειν.

2T35c ib. ***s.v.*** **ἱέραξ**

Ἱέραξ· Παρὰ τὸ ἵεσθαι, ἤγουν φέρεσθαι, ἐν τῷ ἀέρι ῥᾳδίως. Γίνεται δὲ κατὰ κρᾶσιν, ἵραξ·

[sequitur Hes. 2F1.203 Ὧδ'...ἀηδόνα]

Ἡσίοδος. Καὶ γὰρ τῷ Ι εἰ μὲν ἐπιφέρεται τὸ Ε μόνον, εἰς τὸ Ι γίνεται ἡ κρᾶσις· οἷον ἱερεύς, ἱρεύς, κράσει τοῦ Ι καὶ Ε εἰς Ι· ἱέραξ, ἵραξ· ἱερόν, ἱρόν· ἱερά, ἱρά· εἰ δὲ ἐπιφέρεται τὸ ΕΙ ἐν διφθόγγῳ, ἡ ΕΙ δίφθογγος ἐπικρατεῖ, οἷον ὑγίεια, ὑγεία.

2T36 ***Et. Sym.*** **α 285 Lasserre-Livadaras**

[laudatur Hes. 2F1.202 νῦν...ἐρέω]

παρὰ τὸ ἰαίνω, τὸ τέρπω καὶ εὐφραίνω καὶ διαχέω, οἷον· ἰαίνετο δὲ φρένας εἴσω [A.R. 3.1019]. ἴαινος—τοῦ ι γίνεται αἶνος. αἶνος καὶ ὁ ἔπαινος προπερισπωμένως. καὶ ῥῆμα—διαχέω, ἴαινος καὶ αἶνος. Αἶνος δὲ καὶ πόλις Θρᾴκης, τὸ ἔθνικον Αἴνιος.

2T37 Ps.-Zonar. *Lex. s.v.* αἶνος

Αἶνος. ὁ ἔπαινος. παρὰ τὸ ἰαίνω τὸ τέρπω, καὶ διαχέω τὴν ψυχήν, ἴαινος καὶ αἶνος.

[laudatur Hes. 2F1.202, νῦν...ἐρέω]

2T38a Moschop. *in* Hes. *Op.* 200

ΝΥΝ Δ' ΑΙΝΟΝ. Νῦν δὲ παροιμιώδη λόγον ἐπὶ παραινέσει τοῖς κριταῖς ἐρῶ, γινώσκουσι καὶ αὐτοῖς.

2T38b ib. 201

ΩΔ' ἹΡΗΞ ΠΡΟΣΕΕΙΠΕ. Παραβολὴ μυθική·

οὕτως εἶπεν ἱέραξ πρὸς ἀηδόνα ποικιλόφωνον, ὑψοῦ μάλα ἐν νέφεσι φέρων αὐτήν, τοῖς αὐτοῦ ὄνυξι μεμαρπὼς [~ Hes. 2F1.203-204], ἤγουν συλλαβών.

Εἶτα πρὸ τοῦ ἀποδοῦναι ἐπάγει διὰ μέσους

ἡ δὲ ἐλεεινὸν ὠδύρετο πεπερονημένη ἐν ὄνυξι γναμπτοῖς [~ 204],

τουτέστι κεκαμμένοις, ἀγκύλοις, πρὸς ὃ ἀποδίδωσιν ὃν ἤρξατο λόγον ἐπαναλαμβάνων, τὸ τοιοῦτον δὲ γίνεται καὶ παρὰ τῷ πεζῷ λόγῳ, καὶ φησὶ πρὸς ταύτην,

οὗτος λόγον εἶπεν ἐπικρατέως [~ 206],

ἀπηνῶς, τουτέστι μετὰ γνώμης τὴν αὐτοῦ ἐπικράτειαν ἐμφαινούσης, ὃ ταὐτὸν τῷ ὑπεροπτικῶς.

2T38c ib. 205

ΔΑΙΜΟΝΙΗ.

Ἤγουν κακόδαιμον, τί βοᾷς; κατέχει σε κατὰ πολὺ ἰσχυρότερος, ἐκεῖσε πορεύσῃ, ὅποι ἂν ἐγώ σε ἄγω, καίπερ οὖσαν μουσικὴν μελῳδόν· δεῖπνον δὲ, ἤγουν τροφὴν, ποιήσομαί σε ἂν θέλω, ἢ ἀπολύσω. Ἄφρων δέ ἐστιν, ὃς ἂν ἐθέλῃ πρὸς ἐπικρατεστέρους ἀντιτάττεσθαι· καὶ νίκης γὰρ στέρεται, ἤγουν ἀπολείπεται, ἀποπίπτει, τουτέστι καὶ νίκην οὐ κατορθοῖ, καὶ πρὸς τοῖς ὀνείδεσι τοῖς ἀπὸ τῆς ἥττης, λύπας ὑπομένει [~ Hes. 2F1.207-211].

2T38d ib. 210

ὩΣ ΕΦΑΤ'.

Οὕτως εἶπεν ὁ ἱέραξ, ὁ ταχέως πετόμενος, ὁ ὄρνις ὁ ἐπὶ πολὺ παρατείνων τὴν πτῆσιν [~ Hes. 2F1.212]·

ὦ Πέρση, σὺ δὲ μὴ κατὰ τὸν ἀετὸν ποίει, δηλονότι ἄλογον ὄντα ζῶον, ἀλλὰ λογικὸς ὢν ὑπάκουε δίκης, μὴ δ' ὕβριν ἐπίτεινε. (...)

2T39a *gloss. Cod. Gal. ad Op.* 208
ἀηδόν᾽· καίπερ οὖσαν ἀηδόνα.

2T39b ib. 210
ἀντιφερίζειν· πολεμεῖν, ἀντιλέγειν.

2T40 Ps.-Ammon. *Diff.* 18 (p. 6 Nickau)
[Hes. 2T4 (Luc. Tarrh.)]

2T41 Apostol. *Praef.* 5
[praecedunt Archil. 4T45-46ab]
Καὶ Ἡσίοδος·
[sequitur Hes. 2F1, 202-203 (νόεουσι)]
[sequitur Call. 20T16]

2T42 Σ *in* Il. (*Cod. Reg.* 3058), sv αἶνος (III 371 Cramer)
[praecedunt Archil. 4T47-48ab]
καὶ Ἡσίοδος·
[sequitur Hes. 2F1, 202-203]
[sequitur Call. 20T17]

2T43 Abst. *Praef.* (p. 534 Neveletus)
[praecedit Stesich. 7T9]

Cum populus Romanus ab Senatu secessisset, quod tributum & militiam toleraret, nec vllo pacto reduci posset, nonne Agrippa Menenius cum hoc apologo reuocauit?

Olim, inquiens, Quirites, humani artus ventrem ociosum & desidem intuentes, ab eo discordarunt, nec amplius illi cibum ministrare decreuerunt. Sed cum ipsi quoque alimenta illi denegando, quæ per omnia membra deferuntur, deficerent, cum eo in gratiam redierunt.

Eodem, inquit, modo, Senatus & populus, quasi venter & membra, alterum alterius auxilio indigent, & vt discordia intereunt, ita concordia valent. Qua fabula populus reuocatus, cum Senatu in gratiam rediit.

Non immerito igitur non solum Græci & Latini poetæ, vt Hesiodus & Horatius, huiusmodi fabulas suis operibus inseruerunt,...

[sequuntur Pl. 49T14 Arist. 52T2]

2T44 Erasm. *Cop.* 2 (p. 254 Knott)

DE APOLOGIS

Ad fabulosorum genus proxime accedunt apologi, nisi quod et delectant vehementius et efficacius persuadent. Delectant morum faceta quadam imitatione; faciunt fidem, quia verum veluti ponunt ante oculos. Capiuntur his praecipue rustici et imperiti, et si quis alius est qui mores aurei seculi sapit. Celebrantur apologi maxime Aesopi nomine, qui vnus e sapientum numero ob hoc ipsum est habitus. Etiam si Quintilianus

ab Hesiodo scriptas fuisse,

certe maioris cuiuspiam ingenii opus existimat. Quo minus mirandum, si Menenius

Agrippa plebem Romanam a periculosissima seditione reuocauit, conficto in id apologo de corporis humani membris aduersus ventrem conspirantibus, vt refert T. Liuius. Et Themistocles Atheniensibus persuasit ne nouarent magistratus, fabula de vulpe muscis obsita.

2T45 Melanchthon, *Util. fab.* (col. 119 Bretschneider)

[praecedit Hom. 1T6]

Hesiodum tanta fuisse prudentia apparet, ut carmen eius divinum videri voluerint, qui senserunt eum calamis a Musis acceptis vatem esse factum. Is vero cum persuasissimum suis civibus esse vellet, nihil foedius, nihil immanius esse violentia seu iniuria, rem ipsam velut in tabula depinxit, composito de accipitre et luscinia apologo. Docebat hic quoque graecam iuventutem, et non sunt contemnendi scriptores, qui Aesopicas fabulas ab ipso confictas prodiderunt.

[sequitur D. 40T13]

2F1 Hes. *Op.* 202-212

μηκέτ' ἔπειτ' ὤφελλον ἐγὼ πέμπτοισι μετεῖναι
ἀνδράσιν, ἀλλ' ἢ πρόσθε θανεῖν ἢ ἔπειτα γενέσθαι.
νῦν γὰρ δὴ γένος ἐστὶ σιδήρεον· οὐδέ ποτ' ἦμαρ
παύσονται καμάτου καὶ ὀιζύος οὐδέ τι νύκτωρ
τειρόμενοι· χαλεπὰς δὲ θεοὶ δώσουσι μερίμνας.
ἀλλ' ἔμπης καὶ τοῖσι μεμείξεται ἐσθλὰ κακοῖσιν.
Ζεὺς δ' ὀλέσει καὶ τοῦτο γένος μερόπων ἀνθρώπων,
εὖτ' ἂν γεινόμενοι πολιοκρόταφοι τελέθωσιν.
οὐδὲ πατὴρ παίδεσσιν ὁμοίιος οὐδέ τι παῖδες,
οὐδὲ ξεῖνος ξεινοδόκῳ καὶ ἑταῖρος ἑταίρῳ,
οὐδὲ κασίγνητος φίλος ἔσσεται, ὡς τὸ πάρος περ.
αἶψα δὲ γηράσκοντας ἀτιμήσουσι τοκῆας·
μέμψονται δ' ἄρα τοὺς χαλεποῖς βάζοντες ἔπεσσιν,
σχέτλιοι, οὐδὲ θεῶν ὄπιν εἰδότες· οὐδὲ μὲν οἵ γε
γηράντεσσι τοκεῦσιν ἀπὸ θρεπτήρια δοῖεν.
χειροδίκαι· ἕτερος δ' ἑτέρου πόλιν ἐξαλαπάξει·
οὐδέ τις εὐόρκου χάρις ἔσσεται οὐδὲ δικαίου
οὔτ' ἀγαθοῦ, μᾶλλον δὲ κακῶν ῥεκτῆρα καὶ ὕβριν
ἀνέρα τιμήσουσι· δίκη δ' ἐν χερσὶ καὶ αἰδώς
ἐσσεῖται· βλάψει δ' ὁ κακὸς τὸν ἀρείονα φῶτα
μύθοισι σκολιοῖς ἐνέπων, ἐπὶ δ' ὅρκον ὀμεῖται.
ζῆλος δ' ἀνθρώποισιν ὀιζυροῖσιν ἅπασιν
δυσκέλαδος κακόχαρτος ὁμαρτήσει, στυγερώπης.
καὶ τότε δὴ πρὸς Ὄλυμπον ἀπὸ χθονὸς εὐρυοδείης
λευκοῖσιν φάρεσσι καλυψαμένω χρόα καλόν
ἀθανάτων μετὰ φῦλον ἴτον προλιπόντ' ἀνθρώπους
Αἰδὼς καὶ Νέμεσις· τὰ δὲ λείψεται ἄλγεα λυγρά
θνητοῖς ἀνθρώποισι, κακοῦ δ' οὐκ ἔσσεται ἀλκή.

νῦν δ' αἶνον βασιλεῦσ' ἐρέω, φρονέουσι καὶ αὐτοῖς.
ὧδ' ἴρηξ προσέειπεν ἀηδόνα ποικιλόδειρον,
ὕψι μάλ' ἐν νεφέεσσι φέρων, ὀνύχεσσι μεμαρπώς·

ἡ δ' ἐλεόν, γναμπτοῖσι πεπαρμένη ἀμφ' ὀνύχεσσιν,
μύρετο· τὴν δ' ὅ γ' ἐπικρατέως πρὸς μῦθον ἔειπεν·
"δαιμονίη, τί λέληκας; ἔχει νύ σε πολλὸν ἀρείων·
τῇ δ' εἶς ᾗ σ' ἂν ἐγώ περ ἄγω καὶ ἀοιδὸν ἐοῦσαν·
δεῖπνον δ' αἴ κ' ἐθέλω ποιήσομαι ἠὲ μεθήσω.
ἄφρων δ' ὅς κ' ἐθέλῃ πρὸς κρείσσονας ἀντιφερίζειν·
νίκης τε στέρεται πρός τ' αἴσχεσιν ἄλγεα πάσχει."
ὣς ἔφατ' ὠκυπέτης ἴρηξ, τανυσίπτερος ὄρνις.
ὦ Πέρση, σὺ δ' ἄκουε Δίκης, μηδ' ὕβριν ὄφελλε·
ὕβρις γάρ τε κακὴ δειλῷ βροτῷ· οὐδὲ μὲν ἐσθλός
ῥηιδίως φερέμεν δύναται, βαρύθει δέ θ' ὑπ' αὐτῆς
ἐγκύρσας Ἄτῃσιν· ὁδὸς δ' ἑτέρηφι παρελθεῖν
κρείσσων ἐς τὰ δίκαια· παθὼν δέ τε νήπιος ἔγνω·
αὐτίκα γὰρ τρέχει Ὅρκος ἅμα σκολιῇσι δίκῃσιν,
τῆς δὲ Δίκης ῥόθος ἑλκομένης ᾗ κ' ἄνδρες ἄγωσιν
δωροφάγοι, σκολιῇς δὲ δίκῃς κρίνωσι θέμιστας.
ἡ δ' ἕπεται κλαίουσα πόλιν καὶ ἤθεα λαῶν,
ἠέρα ἑσσαμένη, κακὸν ἀνθρώποισι φέρουσα
οἵ τέ μιν ἐξελάσουσι καὶ οὐκ ἰθεῖαν ἔνειμαν.
οἳ δὲ δίκας ξείνοισι καὶ ἐνδήμοισι διδοῦσιν
ἰθείας καὶ μή τι παρεκβαίνουσι δικαίου,
τοῖσι τέθηλε πόλις, λαοὶ δ' ἀνθέουσιν ἐν αὐτῇ·
Εἰρήνη δ' ἀνὰ γῆν κουροτρόφος, οὐδέ ποτ' αὐτοῖς
ἀργαλέον πόλεμον τεκμαίρεται εὐρύοπα Ζεύς·
οὐδέ ποτ' ἰθυδίκῃσι μετ' ἀνδράσι Λιμὸς ὀπηδεῖ
οὐδ' Ἄτη, θαλίῃς δὲ μεμηλότα ἔργα νέμονται.
τοῖσι φέρει μὲν γαῖα πολὺν βίον, οὔρεσι δὲ δρῦς
ἄκρη μέν τε φέρει βαλάνους, μέσση δὲ μελίσσας·
εἰροπόκοι δ' ὄιες μαλλοῖς καταβεβρίθασιν·
τίκτουσιν δὲ γυναῖκες ἐοικότα τέκνα γονεῦσιν·
θάλλουσιν δ' ἀγαθοῖσι διαμπερές· οὐδ' ἐπὶ νηῶν
νίσονται, καρπὸν δὲ φέρει ζείδωρος ἄρουρα.
οἷς δ' ὕβρις τε μέμηλε κακὴ καὶ σχέτλια ἔργα,
τοῖς δὲ δίκην Κρονίδης τεκμαίρεται εὐρύοπα Ζεύς.
πολλάκι καὶ ξύμπασα πόλις κακοῦ ἀνδρὸς ἀπηύρα,
ὅστις ἀλιτραίνει καὶ ἀτάσθαλα μηχανάαται.
τοῖσιν δ' οὐρανόθεν μέγ' ἐπήγαγε πῆμα Κρονίων,
λιμὸν ὁμοῦ καὶ λοιμόν· ἀποφθινύθουσι δὲ λαοί·
οὐδὲ γυναῖκες τίκτουσιν, μινύθουσι δὲ οἶκοι
Ζηνὸς φραδμοσύνῃσιν Ὀλυμπίου· ἄλλοτε δ' αὖτε
ἢ τῶν γε στρατὸν εὐρὺν ἀπώλεσεν ἤ' ὅ γε τεῖχος
ἢ νέας ἐν πόντῳ Κρονίδης ἀποτείνυται αὐτῶν.
ὦ βασιλῆς, ὑμεῖς δὲ καταφράζεσθε καὶ αὐτοί
τήνδε δίκην· ἐγγὺς γὰρ ἐν ἀνθώποισιν ἐόντες
ἀθάνατοι φράζονται, ὅσοι σκολιῇσι δίκῃσιν
ἀλλήλους τρίβουσι θεῶν ὄπιν οὐκ ἀλέγοντες.

τρὶς γὰρ μυρίοι εἰσὶν ἐπὶ χθονὶ πουλυβοτείρῃ
ἀθάνατοι Ζηνὸς φύλακες θνητῶν ἀνθρώπων,
οἵ ῥα φυλάσσουσίν τε δίκας καὶ σχέτλια ἔργα,
ἠέρα ἑσσάμενοι, πάντῃ φοιτῶντες ἐπ' αἶαν.
ἡ δέ τε παρθένος ἐστὶ Δίκη, Διὸς ἐκγεγαυῖα,
κυδρή τ' αἰδοίη τε θεοῖς οἳ Ὄλυμπον ἔχουσιν·
καί ῥ' ὁπότ' ἄν τίς μιν βλάπτῃ σκολιῶς ὀνοτάζων,
αὐτίκα πὰρ Διὶ πατρὶ καθεζομένη Κρονίωνι
γηρύετ' ἀνθρώπων ἄδικον νόον, ὄφρ' ἀποτείσῃ
δῆμος ἀτασθαλίας βασιλέων, οἳ λυγρὰ νοέοντες
ἄλλῃ παρκλίνωσι δίκας σκολιῶς ἐνέποντες.
ταῦτα φυλασσόμενοι βασιλῆς ἰθύνετε μύθους
δωροφάγοι, σκολιῶν δὲ δικέων ἐπὶ πάγχυ λάθεσθε.
οἷ τ' αὐτῷ κακὰ τεύχει ἀνὴρ ἄλλῳ κακὰ τεύχων,
ἡ δὲ κακὴ βουλὴ τῷ βουλεύσαντι κακίστη.
πάντα ἰδὼν Διὸς ὀφθαλμὸς καὶ πάντα νοήσας
καί νυ τάδ' αἴ κ' ἐθέλῃσ' ἐπιδέρκεται, οὐδέ ἑ λήθει
οἵην δὴ καὶ τήνδε δίκην πόλις ἐντὸς ἐέργει.
νῦν δὴ ἐγὼ μήτ' αὐτὸς ἐν ἀνθρώποισι δίκαιος
εἴην μήτ' ἐμὸς υἱός, ἐπεὶ κακὸν ἄνδρα δίκαιον
ἔμμεναι, εἰ μείζω γε δίκην ἀδικώτερος ἕξει·
ἀλλὰ τά γ' οὔ πω ἔολπα τελεῖν Δία μητιόεντα.
ὦ Πέρση, σὺ δὲ ταῦτα μετὰ φρεσὶ βάλλεο σῇσιν,
καί νυ Δίκης ἐπάκουε, βίης δ' ἐπιλήθεο πάμπαν.
τόνδε γὰρ ἀνθρώποισι νόμον διέταξε Κρονίων,
ἰχθύσι μὲν καὶ θηρσὶ καὶ οἰωνοῖς πετεηνοῖς
ἔσθειν ἀλλήλους, ἐπεὶ οὐ δίκη ἐστὶ μετ' αὐτοῖς·
ἀνθρώποισι δ' ἔδωκε δίκην, ἣ πολλὸν ἀρίστη
γίνεται· εἰ γάρ τίς κ' ἐθέλῃ τὰ δίκαι' ἀγορεῦσαι
γινώσκων, τῷ μέν τ' ὄλβον διδοῖ εὐρύοπα Ζεύς·
ὃς δέ κε μαρτυρίῃσιν ἑκὼν ἐπίορκον ὀμόσσας
ψεύσεται, ἐν δὲ Δίκην βλάψας νήκεστον ἀάσθῃ,
τοῦ δέ τ' ἀμαυροτέρη γενεὴ μετόπισθε λέλειπται·
ἀνδρὸς δ' εὐόρκου γενεὴ μετόπισθεν ἀμείνων.

3. *Nicander*

3T1a Σ *in Ther.* 343-354

Ὠγύγιος· βούλεται εἰπεῖν ἀπὸ μύθου τὸ εἶναι ἀργὰς τὰς διψάδας ἐν πορείᾳ.

οἱ ἄνθρωποί, φησιν, ποτε παρεκάλεσαν τοὺς θεοὺς δοθῆναι αὐτοῖς νεότητα πρὸς τὸ μηδέποτε γηρᾶν αὐτούς. λαβόντες οὖν, φησι, δεδώκασιν ὄνῳ βαστάζειν. ὁ δὲ δίψει συνεχόμενος ἦλθεν εἴς τινα τόπον ὕδωρ ἔχοντα, ἐν ᾧ ὄφις ὑπῆρχε φυλάττων. καὶ δή,

φησι, βουλόμενον πιεῖν τὸν ὄνον ὁ ὄφις ἐκώλυσε φήσας· ἐὰν δῷς μοι ἃ βαστάζεις, συγχωρῶ πιεῖν σε. ὁ δὲ ὄνος ὑπὸ τῆς δίψης συνεχόμενος δέδωκεν αὐτῷ ἃ ἐβάσταζε, τουτέστι τὴν νεότητα, ἀφ' οὗ χρόνου οἱ μὲν ὄφεις ἀποβάλλουσιν, οἱ δὲ ἄνθρωποι ὑπὸ τοῦ γήρως καταπονοῦνται. ὁ οὖν ὄφις δεξάμενος ἀπὸ τοῦ ὄνου τὸ δῶρον τῶν θεῶν ἀργότερος ὑπάρχει περὶ τὴν πορείαν καὶ τὸ δῆγμα, ἀνέλαβε δὲ καὶ τὴν τοῦ ὄνου δίψαν· ὅθεν καὶ τοῖς δακνομένοις ὑπ' αὐτοῦ δίψαν ἐμποιεῖ.

[sequuntur Nic. 3T1b S. 14T2]

3T1b ibid.

[praecedit Nic. 3T1a]

Ἄλλως· ὁ μῦθός οὗτος Προμήθειός ἐστιν.

Προμηθέα τὸ πῦρ κλέψαντα καὶ τοῖς ἀνθρώποις δωρησάμενον οἱ λαβόντες ἐμήνυσαν οὐ καλὴν τῆς χάριτος τίνοντες ἀμοιβήν· ἐφ' οἷς τὸν Δία φησὶν ἐπαινέσαντα φάρμακον αὐτοῖς ἀγηρασίας δοῦναι· τοὺς δὲ λαβόντας ἀποφέρειν τὸ δωρηθὲν ἐπὶ ὄνου· τὸν δὲ δίψει τειρόμενον ἐλθεῖν εἰς κρήνην, ἣν ἐφύλασσεν ὄφις, καὶ τοῦ ποτοῦ ὀρεγόμενος ἀπέδοτο τοῦ γήρως τὸ φάρμακον. διὸ πάντας μὲν τοὺς ὄφεις καθ' ἕκαστον νεάζειν ἐνιαυτὸν ἀποδυομένους τὸ γῆρας, τὸν δὲ ὄφιν τὸν τῆς κρήνης φύλακα καταλαβεῖν τὸ δίψος· ὅθεν τοῖς δηχθεῖσιν ἐμποιεῖ δίψαν.

[sequitur S. 14T2]

ὠγύγιος δὲ ἀπὸ ὠγύγου, τουτέστιν ἀρχαῖος καὶ παλαιός.

3T1c ib. 343a

ὠγύγιος...μῦθος· παλαιὰ μυθολογία

3T1d ib. 346b

γέρας πόρεν· τοῦτο ὁμηρικόν· ὁ γὰρ Ζεὺς ἐχαρίσατο γήρως ἀπόδοσιν τοῖς ἀνθρώποις *V*

3T1e ibid. c

πόρεν· παρέσχε τοῖς ἀνθρώποις ὥσπερ τι γέρας τὴν νεότητα δ παρέσχε *f*

3T1f ib. 347c

ἔνιπτον δὲ ἀντὶ τοῦ διεβάλλοντο, ἐλοιδοροῦντο τῷ Προμηθεῖ ὅτι μὴ ἀεὶ αὐτοὺς νέους ἐποίησεν.

3T1g ib. 348a

ἄφρονες· οἱ ἄνθρωποι ὀκνηροὶ ὄντες ἐπρεσβεύοντο δι' ὄνου περὶ τῶν ἀναγκαίων. ἐβλάβησαν δὲ ὑπὸ τῆς ἀβουλίας. τοῦτο γὰρ σημαίνει τὸ κακοφραδίης.

3T1h ibid. e
ἀπόνηντο· †. ει. τοῦ † νεότητος ἔδωκεν τοῖς ἀνθρώποις Ζεύς *K*² ὠφελήθησαν *d*

3T1i ib. 349b
ἀμορβεύοντο· ἀντὶ τοῦ διηκονοῦντο, ἐθεραπεύοντο, ἐφέροντο ἐπὶ ὄνῳ διὰ τὸ ὀκνηρὸν αὐτῶν. ἀμορβεύειν γὰρ τὸ ἀκολουθεῖν καὶ ὑπηρετεῖν. Νίκανδρος [fr. 90 Gow]· "βουκαῖοι ζεύγεσσιν ἀμορβεύουσιν ὀρήων." ἐν ἑτέρῳ δὲ εἶπε Καλλίμαχος [Hymn. 3.45]· "οὕνεκ' οὐ Λητωίδι πέμπον ἀμορβούς." τὸ δὲ ἑξῆς, τῷ λεπάργῳ τὰ δῶρα δόντες ἠκολούθουν. δῶρα δὲ τὴν νεότητα καὶ λεπάργῳ τῷ ὄνῳ, παρὰ τὸ ἔχειν τὴν λαγόνα λευκήν. εἰς τὸ δῶρα προσυπακουστέον τὸ δόντες, ἐπὶ τὸ βαστάσαι δηλονότι.

3T1j ib. 354b
ἄφρονα τὸν ὄνον λέγει ἐκ τοιαύτης περιπετείας. δῶρον δὲ τὴν νεότητα, ἣν ἐπ' ὄνου ἔφερον, μὴ δυνάμενοι αὐτὴν βαστάσαι διὰ τὸ ὀκνηρόν.

3T1k ib. 355a
γηραλέον δὲ φλόον τὸ σῦφαρ λέγει. διὰ δὴ τὸν προκείμενον λόγον τὰ μὲν ἑρπετὰ τὸ γῆρας ἀποβάλλει καὶ ἀεὶ σχεδὸν ἐν νεότητι διατελεῖ, οἱ δὲ ἄνθρωποι γηρῶντες φθείρονται.

3T2 Eutecn. *in Ther.* 343-358
Τῇ ἐχίδνῃ κατὰ πολλὰ ἔοικεν ἡ διψάς, τὸ μὲν μῆκος ἔχουσα ἐκείνης ἔλασσον, ἐνεργοτέρα δὲ ἀποκτεῖναι ὡς ὅτι μάλιστα ὑφ' ἑαυτῆς τὸν πληγέντα θᾶττον. Ἔχει δὲ τὴν μὲν οὐρὰν μελαινομένην ἀκριβῶς ἤδε κατ' αὐτὴν τὴν ἄκραν, τὸ δὲ δῆγμα αὐτῆς δεινῶς αἴθει τὴν καρδίαν, καὶ ἐντεῦθεν ἄρχεται τὸ κακόν, καὶ μεταδίδωσι τῷ παντὶ δηλαδὴ σώματι. Γίγνεται δὲ ἀμήχανος περί τε τὸ στόμα καὶ τὰ χείλη αὐχμὸς τοῦ τρωθέντος λίαν, ἰάσασθαί τε τὸν πόνον τὸν ἀπὸ τοῦ δίψους ἐπιτιθέμενον αὐτῷ οὐχ οἷός τέ ἐστιν τοῦ λοιποῦ, οὐδὲ μὴν τὴν ταλαιπωρίαν. Ἀπαγορεύων γοῦν τοῖς παροῦσι, καὶ οὐκ ἔχων ὅτῳ καὶ χρήσεται, ἐλθὼν ἐπὶ πηγήν τινα ἢ αὐτοῦ ⟨τοῦ⟩ φρέατος πλησίον ταῦρος ὥς τις διψῶν καὶ οὗτος ἔρχεται ἐπὶ τὸν ποταμόν, εἶτα ἀπλήστως ἔχων τοῦ ὕδατος, τούτου ἐμφορεῖται πολλοῦ, καὶ οὐκ ἀνίησιν εἰς τοσοῦτον, ἐς ὅσον οὗ τῆς γαστρὸς ῥαγείσης, ἔξω τὰ ἐν αὐτῇ πάντα μετὰ τοῦ ὕδατος ἐνεχθείη. Φέρεταί γε μὴν κατ' αὐτά που τοιόσδε τις λόγος, ὅτι,

ὁπηνίκα, φησίν, διενείματο ὁ Ζεὺς τὴν ἀρχὴν μετὰ τῶν ἀδελφῶν, καὶ εἶχεν ἕκαστος τὴν ἑαυτοῦ, Διὶ δὲ ἔμελεν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ ἐβασίλευεν, δόξαν δὲ οὕτω, τοὺς ἀνθρώπους αὐτῷ τῆς νεότητος ἐσέμνυνεν περιφανῶς δώρῳ, ὅτι αὐτῷ κατεμήνυσαν τὴν κλοπὴν τοῦ πυρός. Ἀλλ' οἱ μὲν τὴν νεότητα ἐκ Διὸς λαβόντες ἵνα αὐτῇ χρῷντο, ἀβουλίας τε καὶ ἀφροσύνης ἔργον εἰργάσαντο, οὐ γὰρ δὴ μή, μεθέντες, ἀπώναντο αὐτῆς. Ἐπισάξαντες δὲ ὄνον, ἐπέ-

θεσαν αὐτήν, μετὰ δὲ οὗτος μὲν ἀπῄε τὴν ὁδὸν ὁ ὄνος, καταλαμβανόμενος δὲ ὑπὸ δίψης πικρῶς καὶ πνευστιῶν λίαν ἔρχεται ἐπὶ τὸν φωλεόν, ὡς ὁ λόγος, τότε τοῦ θηρίου τούτου· ἐκ Νυμφῶν δὲ ἦν ἐπιτραπὲν τοῦτο, κρήνης εἶναι φύλαξ· ἐδεῖτο οὖν ἐλθὼν εὐθέως τοῦ θηρίου τούτου, ἄκεσιν παρ' αὐτοῦ δέξασθαι τῶν λυπούντων αὐτὸν καὶ ἀπαλλαγῆναι· ὑπισχνεῖται παρέξειν ταῦτα τὸ θηρίον, ἣν καὶ ⟨ὁ⟩ ὄνος ἀφ' ὧνπερ ἔχων ἔρχεται φορτίων παρασχεῖν βουληθῇ, καὶ διὰ τοῦτο ἐξ ἐκείνου τὰ μὲν θηρία ἀποτιθέμενα τὸ γῆρας αὖθις ἐπανέρχεται εἰς τὴν νεότητα, τὸ δὲ τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἐπίκηρον γένος ἀνέχεται περιμένον τὰ τοῦ γήρως κακά, οὐδὲ ἀποξύσασθαι δύναται. Ἐντεῦθεν μὲν οὖν τὸ διψῆν τούτῳ προσετέθη, καὶ καλεῖται διψὰς τὸ θηρίον, θάνατον δὲ ὀξύτερον ἐπάγει οἷς ἂν ὑπάρξειεν πληγῆναι παρ' αὐτοῦ, ὅτι καὶ φλέγεσθαι ὑπὸ δίψης τοὺς τρωθέντας ποιεῖ.

3T3 ***Et. Gen.* α 672 Lasserre-Livadaras**

† ἀμορμεύοντο· σημαίνει δὲ τὸ διεκόμιζον· Νίκανδρος ἐν Θηριακοῖς·
[sequitur Nic. 3F1, 349 (νῶθεὶ, †ἀμορμεύοντο†, λοπάργῳ)]
τῷ ὄνῳ, ἐπεὶ κατὰ τὴν κοιλίαν λευκή ἐστιν. AB

3F1 **Nic. *Ther.* 343-358**

Ναὶ μὴν διψάδος εἶδος ὁμώσεται αἰὲν ἐχίδνῃ
παυροτέρῃ, θανάτου δὲ θοώτερος ἵξεται αἶσα
οἷσιν ἐνισκίμψῃ βλοσυρὸν δάκος· ἤτοι ἀραιή
αἰὲν ὑποζοφόεσσα μελαίνεται ἄκροθεν οὐρή·
δάχματι δ' ἐμφλέγεται κραδίη πρόπαν, ἀμφὶ δὲ καύσῳ
χείλε' ὑπ' ἀζαλέης αὐαίνεται ἄβροχα δίψης·
αὐτὰρ ὅγ', ἠύτε ταῦρος ὑπὲρ ποταμοῖο νενευκώς,
χανδὸν ἀμέτρητον δέχεται ποτὸν εἰσόκε νηδύς
ὀμφαλὸν †ἐξξέρρηξε† χέῃ δ' ὑπεραχθέα φόρτον.
ὠγύγιος δ' ἄρα μῦθος ἐν αἰζηοῖσι φορεῖται,
ὡς,
ὁπότ' οὐρανὸν ἔσχε Κρόνου πρεσβίστατον αἷμα
Νειμάμενος κασίεσσιν ἑκὰς περικυδέας ἀρχάς
Ιδμοσύνῃ νεότητα γέρας πόρεν ἡμερίοισι
Κυδαίνων· δὴ γάρ ῥα πυρὸς ληίστορ' ἔνιπτον.
Αφρονες, οὐ μὲν τῆς γε κακοφραδίης ἀπόνηντο·
Νωθεῖς γὰρ κάμνοντες ἀμορβεύοντο λεπάργῳ
Δῶρα· πολύσκαρθμος δὲ κεκαυμένος αὐχένα δίψῃ
Ρώετο, γωλειοῖσι δ' ἰδὼν ὁλκήρεα θῆρα
Οὐλοὸν ἐλλιτάνευε κακῇ ἐπαλαλκέμεν ἄτῃ
Σαίνων· αὐτὰρ ὁ βρῖθος ὃ δή ῥ' ἀνεδέξατο νώτοις

ἤτεεν ἄφρονα δῶρον· ὁ δ' οὐκ ἀπανήνατο χρειώ.
ἐξότε γηραλέον μὲν ἀεὶ φλόον ἑρπετὰ βάλλει
ὁλκήρη, θνητοὺς δὲ κακὸν περὶ γῆρας ὀπάζει·
νοῦσον δ' ἀζαλέην βρωμήτορος οὐλομένη θὴρ
δέξατο, καί τε τυπῆσιν ἀμυδροτέρῃσιν ἰάπτει.

4. *Archilochus*

4T1 Pl. *R.* 2.8, 365c4-6
[vide Pl. 49A2]

4T2 Erot. σ 25 (p. 79 Nachmanson)
σκύτα· τὸ μεταξὺ τῶν τενόντων [καὶ] τοῦ τραχήλου, ὡς Πετρώνιος † ἐν κάρῃ φησίν· '† αἰγάδες ὑπέκνεον καὶ πάλαι τὰ σχήματα εὐθὺς ἰδὼν καὶ τὰ σκύτα'. καὶ Ἀρχίλοχος λέγων·
[sequitur Archil. 4F3]
τινὲς δέ φασι σκύτα λέγεσθαι τὸν νωτιαῖον μυελόν. οἱ δὲ τὸ ἰνίον. οἱ δὲ τὸν μεταξὺ τοῦ μετώπου καὶ τῶν ὀφρύων τόπον, ὅπερ ἐπισκύνιον καλοῦμεν. τινὲς δὲ σκύτα εἶπον τὸ τῆς κεφαλῆς δέρμα. παρ' ὃ καὶ ἡ ⟨κεφαλὴ⟩ σκύτος εἴρηται.

4T3 Theon, *Prog.* 3 (II 73 Spengel)
[vide supra Hom. 1T1]

4T4 Luc. Tarrh. fr. 1 Linnenkugel
[praecedit Luc. Tarrh. G21]
...παρ' Ἀρχιλόχῳ·
[sequitur Archil. 4F1a (ξυνωνίην ἔθεντο)]
καὶ τὰ ἑξῆς.
[sequuntur Archil. 4T5ab]

4T5a ibid.
[praecedit Archil. 4T4]
καὶ πάλιν, ὅταν λέγῃ·
[sequitur Archil. 4F2a.1-2 (ἀχνυμένη σκυτάλῃ)],
[sequitur Archil. 4T5b]

4T5b ibid.
[praecedunt Archil. 4T4-5a]
...εἶτ' ἐπιφέρει·
[sequitur Archil. 4F2a.3-6].
[sequitur Hes. 2T4]

4T6 D.Chr. 55.10

[praecedit D.Chr. G22]

...τὴν Ἀρχιλόχου ἀλώπεκα...

[pergit testimonium]

4T7 id. 74.15

15 τὸν δὲ Λύσανδρον τὸν Λακεδαμόνιον γνώμην ἀποφαίνεσθαι λέγουσιν ὅτι τοὺς μὲν παῖδας ἀστραγάλοις καὶ σφαίραις ἐξαπατᾶν δεῖ, τοὺς δὲ ἄνδρας ὅρκοις καὶ ῥήμασιν.

ἡ κερδαλῆ δὲ ἀλώπηξ ἑτέρα τίς ἐστι παρὰ Ἀρχιλόχῳ;

4T8 Herennius Ph. fr. 32 Palmieri

[idem atque Archil. 4T4 (Luc. Tarrh.)]

4T9a ibid.

[idem atque Archil. 4T5a (Luc. Tarrh.)]

4T9b ibid.

[idem atque Archil. 4T5b (Luc. Tarrh.)]

4T10 Ps.-Diogenian. *Praef.* (p. 178 Leutsch-Schneidewin)

[praecedit Ps.-Diogenian. G28]

...παρ' Ἀρχιλόχῳ,

[sequitur Archil. 4F1a].

[sequitur testimonium]

4T11 Aristid. *Or.* 3.664 (p. 512 Behr)

[*ap.* Archil. 4T30 (Phot.)]

664 καίτοι τίς ἂν εἰς ζῶντας τελῶν τούτων ἀνάσχοιτο, οἳ πλείω μὲν σολοικίζουσιν ἢ φθέγγονται, ὑπερορῶσι δὲ τῶν ἄλλων ὅσον αὐτοῖς ὑπερορᾶσθαι προσήκει, καὶ τοὺς μὲν ἄλλους ἐξετάζουσιν, αὐτοὺς δὲ οὐδεπώποτ' ἠξίωσαν, καὶ σεμνύνουσι μὲν τὴν ἀρετήν, ἀσκοῦσι δ' οὐ ⟨τοῖς⟩ πᾶσι, περιέρχονται δὲ ἄλλως "βροτῶν εἴδωλα καμόντων," [Od. λ 476[2]] Ἡσιόδου κηφῆνες,

Ἀρχιλόχου πίθηκοι,

δύο μορφὰς ἔχοντες ἀντὶ τριῶν τῆς τραγικῆς βοός, τῶν ἱματίων τῶν ἡττημένων οὐδὲν διαφέροντες, τὰ μὲν ἔξω σεμνοί, τὰ δ' ἔνδον ἄλλους ⟨ἂν⟩ εἰδείη τις, οὐδὲ μεθ' ἡμέραν σώφρονες, ὡς Δημοσθένης φησίν, ἀλλ' αὐτοῖς καὶ ἡμέρα καὶ νὺξ ταὐτόν ἐστιν δυνηθεῖσιν· οἳ τοῦ μὲν Διὸς οὐδὲν χείρους φασὶν εἶναι, τοῦ δ' ὀβολοῦ τοσοῦτον ἡττῶνται· ὀνειδίζουσι δὲ τοῖς ἄλλοις, οὐ τῶν πραγμάτων κατεγνωκότες, ἀλλὰ φθονοῦντες ὅτι αὐτοὶ ταῦτα πράττειν οὐ δύνανται;

4T12 A.D. *Conj.* 224.2-3 Schneider

[Ἆρα] Ἀρχίλοχος μέντοι κοινότερον ἔφη

[sequitur Archil. 4F1a.2 (...ξυνωνίην)].

4T13a Attic. fr. 2 Des Places *ap.* Eus. *PE* 15.4.4-5

4 Μιᾷ γὰρ ὁδῷ βαδίζοντα, ἥτις ἄγειν πέφυκεν ἐπί τι τῶν μικρῶν καὶ ταπεινῶν, οὐκ ἔστιν ἐλθεῖν ἐπὶ τὰ μείζω καὶ ἐν ὕψει κείμενα.

[sequitur Archil. 4F1c]

5 Ἐπὶ τοῦτον τὸν 'ὑψηλὸν πάγον' τὸ δριμὺ καὶ πανοῦργον ἐκεῖνο θηρίον ἀνελθεῖν ἀδύνατον·

[sequitur 4T13b]

4T13b ibid. 15.4.5

[praecedit 4T13a]

ἵνα δὲ εἰς ταὐτὸν ἔλθῃ τοῖς ἀετοῦ γεννήμασιν ἀλώπηξ, ἢ τύχῃ τινὶ δεῖ χρησαμένους ἐκείνους πονηρᾷ καταπεσεῖν εἰς γῆν τῶν οἰκείων αὐτοῖς φθαρέντων ἢ φύσασαν αὐτήν, ἃ μὴ πέφυκε φύειν,

λαιψηρὰ κυκλῶσαι πτερὰ [cf. Archil. 4F1h.11]

καὶ οὕτως ἀρθεῖσαν ἐκ γῆς ἀναπτέσθαι πρὸς τὸν 'ὑψηλὸν πάγον'· ἕως δ' ἑκάτερον ἐπὶ τῆς οἰκείας μένει τάξεως, οὐκ ἔνι κοινωνία τοῖς γῆς πρὸς τὰ οὐρανοῦ θρέμματα.

4T14 Clem. Al. *Strom.* 5.14.127

5.14.1 τὰ δ' ἑξῆς ⟨προσ⟩αποδοτέον καὶ τὴν ἐκ τῆς βαρβάρου φιλοσοφίας Ἑλληνικὴν κλοπὴν σαφέστερον ἤδη παραστατέον.

(...)

127 παραφράζει δὲ ἐκείνας τὰς προφητικὰς γραφάς, τήν τε διὰ Ὠσηὲ "ἐγὼ στερεῶν βροντὴν καὶ κτίζων πνεῦμα" [LXX, *Am.* 4.13], οὗ αἱ χεῖρες τὴν στρατιὰν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ἐθεμελίωσαν, καὶ τὴν διὰ Μωυσέως· "ἴδετε ἴδετε, ὅτι ἐγώ εἰμι, καὶ οὐκ ἔστι θεὸς ἕτερος πλὴν ἐμοῦ· ἐγὼ ἀποκτενῶ καὶ ζῆν ποιήσω· πατάξω κἀγὼ ἰάσομαι· καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν ὃς ἐξελεῖται ἐκ τῶν χειρῶν μου." [LXX, *De.* 32.39]

αὐτὸς δὲ ἐξ ἀγαθοῖο κακὸν θνητοῖσι φυτεύει
καὶ πόλεμον κρυόεντα καὶ ἄλγεα δακρυόεντα

κατὰ τὸν Ὀρφέα [fr. 5.12-13 Abel]. Τοιαῦτα καὶ ὁ Πάριος Ἀρχίλοχος λέγει·

[sequitur Archil. 4F1d.1-3 ὦ...κἀθέμιστα (⟨πάτερ Ζεῦ⟩, ἔργα)]

4T15 Hermog. *Prog.* 1

[praecedit Hes. 2T9]

...Ἀρχίλοχος δὲ τὸν τῆς ἀλώπεκος [sc. μῦθον εἰπών].

[sequitur Hermog. G41]

4T16 Philostr. *Im.* 1.3

[vide supra Hom. 1T3]

4T17a Eus. *PE* 13.13.54

Τοιαῦτα [sc. ῥητῶς παντοκράτορα ὀνομάζων τὸν θεόν] καὶ ὁ Πάριος Ἀρχίλοχος λέγει·

[sequitur Archil. 4F1d.1-3 κάθεμιστα]

4T17b ib. 15.4.4-5

[vide Archil. 4T13a (Attic.)]

4T17c ib. 15.4.5

[vide Archil. 4T13b (Attic.)]

4T18 Bas. *Leg. lib. gent.* 9

Ἀλλὰ δῆτα πλούτου μὲν ὑπεροψόμεθα, καὶ τὰς διὰ τῶν αἰσθήσεων ἡδονὰς ἀτιμάσομεν, κολακείας δὲ καὶ θωπείας διωξόμεθα, καὶ

τῆς Ἀρχιλόχου ἀλώπεκος τὸ κερδαλέον τε καὶ ποικίλον

ζηλώσομεν; Ἀλλ' οὐκ ἔστιν ὃ μᾶλλον φευκτέον τῷ σωφρονοῦντι τοῦ πρὸς δόξαν ζῆν, καὶ τὰ τοῖς πολλοῖς δοκοῦντα περισκοπεῖν, καὶ μὴ τὸν ὀρθὸν λόγον ἡγεμόνα ποιεῖσθαι τοῦ βίου, ὥστε, κἂν πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις ἀντιλέγειν, κἂν ἀδοξεῖν καὶ κινδυνεύειν ὑπὲρ τοῦ καλοῦ δέῃ, μηδὲν αἱρεῖσθαι τῶν ὀρθῶς ἐγνωσμένων παρακινεῖν.

4T19 Bas. *Virt.* 7

Τὸν γὰρ μὴ οὕτως ἔχοντα, τί τοῦ Αἰγυπτίου σοφιστοῦ φήσομεν ἀπολείπειν, ὃς φυτὸν ἐγένετο καὶ θηρίον, ὁπότε βούλοιτο, καὶ πῦρ καὶ ὕδωρ καὶ πάντα χρήματα· εἴπερ δὴ καὶ αὐτὸς νῦν μὲν τὸ δίκαιον ἐπαινέσεται παρὰ τοῖς τοῦτο τιμῶσι· νῦν δὲ τοὺς ἐναντίους ἀφήσει λόγους, ὅταν τὴν ἀδικίαν εὐδοκιμοῦσαν αἴσθηται, ὅπερ δίκην ἐστὶ κολάκων, καὶ

τῆς Ἀρχιλόχου ἀλώπεκος τὸ κερδαλέον τε καὶ ποικίλον

ζηλοῦν; Ὁ μὲν γὰρ ἀληθὴς λόγος, καὶ ἀπὸ ὑγιοῦς διανοίας προϊών, ἁπλοῦς ἐστι καὶ μονότροπος, τὰ αὐτὰ λέγων περὶ τῶν αὐτῶν πάντοτε· ὁ δὲ ποικίλος καὶ ἔντεχνος, πολὺ τὸ ἐπίπλοκον καὶ ἐγκατάσκευον ἔχων, μυρία κατασχηματίζεται, καὶ στρέφεται στροφὰς ἀμυθήτους, πρὸς τὸ τῶν ἐντυγχανόντων ἀρέσκον μεταμορφούμενος.

4T20 Jul. *Or.* 7, 207bc

[praecedit Hes. 2T11]

...· ὁ δὲ μετὰ τοῦτον Ἀρχίλοχος ὥσπερ ἥδυσμά τι περιτιθεὶς τῇ ποιήσει, μύθοις ⟨οὐκ⟩ ὀλιγάκις ἐχρήσατο ὁρῶν, ὡς εἰκός, τὴν μὲν ὑπόθεσιν, ἣν μετῄει, τῆς τοιαύτης ψυχαγωγίας ἐνδεῶς ἔχουσαν, σαφῶς δὲ ἐγνωκὼς ὅτι στερομένη μύθου ποίησις ἐποποιΐα μόνον ἐστίν, ἐστέρηται δέ, ὡς ἂν εἴποι τις, ἑαυτῆς· οὐ γὰρ ἔτι λείπεται ποίησις· ἡδύσματα ταῦτα παρὰ

τῆς ποιητικῆς Μούσης ἐδρέψατο, [c] καὶ παρέθηκέ γε αὐτὸς τούτου χάριν, ὅπως μὴ σιλλογράφος τις, ἀλλὰ ποιητὴς νομισθείη.
[pergit Jul. G50]

4T21 Stob. 1.3.34
Ἀρχιλόχου.
[sequitur Archil. 4F1d (3 κάθεμιστα)]

4T22 Prisc. *Praeex.* 1
[praecedit Hes. 2T20]
..*Archilochus autem vulpis,*
Horatius muris [*S.* 2.6.79-117].
[pergit Prisc. G70]

4T23 Σ *in* Ar. *Ach.* 120
τοιόνδε δ' ὦ πίθηκε· καὶ τοῦτο παρῴδηκεν ἐκ τῶν Ἀρχιλόχου ἐπ(ῳδ)ῶν·
[sequitur Archil. 4F2c (τοιάνδε, ἔχεις)]. ELh

4T24 Σ *in* Ar. *Ach.* 279
ἐν τῷ φεψάλῳ· ἐν τῷ καπνῷ. φέψαλοι γὰρ οἱ σπινθῆρες, ὡς καὶ ἀλλαχοῦ δηλοῖ· "ἀλλ' οὐδὲ μοιχοῦ καταλέλειπται φεψάλυξ" [Ar. *Lys.* 107]. καὶ παρὰ Ἀρχιλόχῳ δὲ κεῖται·
[sequitur Archil. 4F1g]

4T25 Σ *in* Ar. *Av.* 651b
[praecedit Σ *in* Ar. G66b]
...καὶ τοῦτον τὸν παρὰ τῷ Ἀρχιλόχῳ λεγόμενον, καίτοι πρεσβυτέρῳ ὄντι. RVEΓ

4T26 Σ *in* *Il.* 19.407
[praecedit Hes. 2T18]
...Ἀρχίλοχος
ἐπὶ τοῦ ἀετοῦ,...
[pergit Σ *in* Il. G36]

4T27 Σ *in* Od. 14.508
[praecedit Σ *in* Od. G68]
καὶ Ἀρχίλοχος δὲ λέγει,
[sequitur Archil. 4F1a]
[pergit testimonium]

4T28 Choer. *epimer. in Ps.* (III 114 Gaisford)
Τί διαφέρει αἶνος καὶ παροιμία; Διαφέρει· ὁ μὲν αἶνος λόγος ἐστὶ μυθι-

κός, ἐκφερόμενος ἀπὸ ἀλόγων ζώων ἢ φυτῶν πρὸς ἀνθρώπων παραίνεσιν· ἐπὶ μὲν ἀλόγων ζώων, ὡς

[sequitur Archil. 4F1a (τῶν ἀνθρώπων, καὶ αἰετὸς ξυνωνίαν ἔθεντο)]

[sequitur Call. 20T11]

4T29 ***Et. Gen.*** **α 187 Lasserre-Livadaras**

αἰηνές· τὸ δεινὸν καὶ πολύστονον· Ἀρχίλοχος·

[sequitur Archil. 4F1f]

εἴρηται παρὰ τὸ αἲ αἴ· ἢ τὸ αἰώνιον, μετὰ τοῦτο γὰρ οὐκ ἔστι φαγεῖν τὸν ἀποθνῄσκοντα. οὕτως Μεθόδιος.

4T30 Phot. ***Bibl.*** **248, 437b**

Καίτοι τίς ἂν εἰς ζῶντας τελῶν τούτων ἀνάσχοιτο; Οἳ πλείω μὲν σολοικίζουσιν ἢ φθέγγονται, ὑπερορῶσι δὲ τῶν ἄλλων ὅσον αὐτοῖς ὑπεροράσθαι προσήκει. [Καὶ τοὺς μὲν ἄλλους ἐξετάζουσιν, αὐτοὺς δὲ οὐ πώποτε ἠξίωσαν]. Καὶ σεμνύνουσι μὲν τὴν ἀρετήν, ἀσκοῦσι δ' οὔ, περιέρχονται δὲ ἄλλως βροτῶν εἴδωλα καμνόντων [Od. λ 476[2]], Ἡσιόδου κηφῆνες,

Ἀρχιλόχου πίθηκοι,

δύο μορφὰς ἔχοντες ἀντὶ τριῶν τῆς τραγικῆς βοός. Οἳ τοῦ μὲν Διὸς οὐδὲν χείρους φασὶν εἶναι, τοῦ δ' ὀβολοῦ τοσοῦτον ἡττῶνται. Ὀνειδίζουσι δὲ τοῖς ἄλλοις, οὐ τῶν πραγμάτων κατεγνωκότες, ἀλλὰ φθονοῦντες ὅτι αὐτοὶ ταῦτα πράττειν οὐ δύνανται. [Archil. 4T11 (Aristid.)]

4T31 Jo. Sard. ***in Aphth.*** **(p. 8 Rabe)**

[vide Hom. 1T4]

4T32 Doxap. ***Comm. in Aphth.*** **(II 166 Walz)**

[vide Hom. 1T5]

4T33a ***Et. Gud. s.v.*** **αἶνος (p. 48.17-18 De Stefani)**

αἶνος καὶ παροιμία διαφέρει· ὁ μὲν γὰρ αἶνός ἐστι λόγος κατὰ ἀνάπλασιν μυθικὴν ἀπὸ ἀλόγων ζώων ἢ φυτῶν πρὸς ἀνθρώπους εἰρημένος· οἷον, ἀπ[ὸ μὲν ἀλόγων] ζώων, ὡς παρὰ Ἀρχιλόχῳ

[sequitur Archil. 4F1a (καἰετὸς ξυνεωνίην ἔμειξαν)],

[sequitur Archil. 4T34]

4T33b ib. p. 49.11-13

Αἶνος· ὁ ἔπαινος ὁ εἰς προτροπὴν περιπέτειαν ἔχων παραινετικήν· καὶ Ἀρχίλοχος δὲ λέγει

[sequitur Archil. 4F1a (ξυνωνίαν ἔμιξαν)]

4T34 ibid. p. 48.18-19

[praecedit Archil. 4T33a]

⟦καὶ⟧ ἄλλως

[sequitur Archil. 4F2a.5-6]...

[sequuntur Hes. 2T33 Call. 20T12]

4T35 Eust. *Il.* Λ 430

[praecedit Hes. 2T29c (Eust.)]

Περὶ οὗ δὴ αἴνου καὶ τοιαῦτά φασιν οἱ παλαιοί. Αἶνος καὶ παροιμία διαφέρουσι, καθὸ ὁ μὲν αἶνος λόγος ἐστὶ μυθικὸς ἐκφερόμενος ἀπὸ ἀλόγων ζῴων ἢ φυτῶν πρὸς ἀνθρώπων παραίνεσιν, ὥς φησι Λούκιλλος ὁ Ταρραῖος ἐν πρώτῳ Περὶ παροιμιῶν· ἀπὸ μὲν ἀλόγων, ὡς παρὰ Ἀρχιλόχῳ

[sequitur Archil. 4F1a (ὅδε *om.*, καὶ ἀετὸς ξυνωνίην ἔθεντο)]

[sequuntur Hes. 2T29d Call. 20T13]

4T36 Eust. *Od.* ξ 508

[praecedit Hes. 2T30c]

...καὶ Ἀρχίλοχος δέ φησιν, ὅτι

[sequitur Archil. 4F1a (1 ὁ δ', 2 ἠδ' ἀετὸς ξυνωνίην, 3 ἔμιξαν, ἢ καθ' ἑτέραν γραφήν, ἔθεντο)].

Ἔνθα ὅρα τὸ ξυνωνίην παραχθὲν ἐκ τοῦ ξυνόν, ὅθεν τὸ παρ' Ὁμήρῳ ξυνήϊον, ἵνα ᾖ ξυνωνία ἡ κοινωνία. οὐ δήπου γὰρ ὥς περ ἰσωνία ἡ ἴση πράσις παρὰ τοῖς τεχνικοῖς, οὕτω καὶ ξυνωνία ἐνταῦθα ἡ ξύμπρασις.

[sequuntur Archil. 4T37ab]

4T37a ibid.

[praecedit Archil. 4T36]

ὁ δὲ τὴν εἰρημένην Ἀρχιλόχειον χρῆσιν παραγαγὼν ἐπαγαγὼν καὶ ἑτέραν ὁμοίαν ἐν ᾗ κεῖται ἡ

[sequitur Archil. 4F2a.2 ἀχνυμένη σκυτάλη]

[sequuntur Archil. 4T37b]

4T37b ibid.

[praecedunt Hes. Archil. 4T36-37a]

τὸ περιᾳδόμενον σκῶμμα ἐπιφέρει·

[sequitur Archil. 4F2a.3-6 (5 κερδαλέη, 6 πυκινὸν, νοῦν)]

καὶ ταῦτα μὲν ἀπὸ ἀλόγων.

[sequitur Call. 20T14]

4T38 *EM* α 462 Lasserre-Livadaras

idem atque Archil. 4T29 (*Et. Gen.*) (οὕτω)

4T39 ***EM s.v.*** **σκανδάληθρον**

Σκανδάληθρον· Τὸ πέταυρον τῶν παγίδων· ἀπὸ τοῦ σκαζόμενον συμπίπτειν καὶ κρατεῖν τὸ ἐμπεσόν, ἔστι δὲ τὸ ἐν τῇ παγίδι καμπύλον ξύλον, ᾧ ἐρείδεται. Ἀρχίλοχος δὲ ῥόπτρον ἔφη· οἷον,

[sequitur Archil. 4F2b]

4T40 ***Et. Sym.*** **α 256 Lasserre-Livadaras**

αἰηνές· τὸ δεινὸν καὶ πολύστονον· Ἀρχίλοχος·

[sequitur Archil. 4F1f]

εἴρηται δὲ παρὰ τὸ αἶ αἴ· ἢ τὸ αἰώνιον, μετὰ τοῦτο γὰρ οὐκ ἔστι φαγεῖν τὸν ἀποθνήσκοντα.

4T41 Tricl. ***in*** **Ar.** ***Ach.*** **120**

[vide Archil. 4T23 (Σ)]

4T42 Tricl. ***in*** **Ar.** ***Ach.*** **279**

[id. atque Σ ibid. (Archil. 4T24)]

4T43 Ps.-Ammon. ***Diff.*** **18 (p. 5.11-13 Nickau)**

[= Archil. 4T4 (Luc. Tarrh.)]

4T44a ib. 5.15-16

[= Archil. 4T5a (Luc. Tarrh.)]

4T44b ib. 6.1-4

[= Archil. 4T5b (Luc. Tarrh.)]

4T45 Apostol. ***Praef.*** **5**

Διαφέρει δὲ τοῦ αἴνου [sc. ἡ παροιμία]· ὅτι ὁ μὲν αἶνός ἐστι λόγος μυθικός, ἐκφερόμενος ἀπὸ ἀλόγων ζῴων ἢ φυτῶν πρὸς ἀνθρώπων παραίνεσιν. ἢ λόγος εὐκτικός, ἤτοι παρακλητικός, ἐκ δημιουργημάτων καὶ κατορθωμάτων μνημονευόμενος. Ἡ παροιμία ἐξηπλωμένη μετὰ διηγήσεως, ἀπαρτίζουσα τὸ νοούμενον. ἢ λόγος κατὰ ἀναπόλησιν μυθικὴν ἀπὸ ἀλόγων ζῴων καὶ φυτῶν πρὸς ἀνθρώπους εἰρημένος, ὡς φησὶ Λούκιος Ταρραῖος ἐν τῷ πρώτῳ περὶ παροιμιῶν· οἷον ἀπὸ μὲν ἀλόγων ζῴων, ὡς...

[sequitur Archil. 4F1a]

καὶ τὰ ἑξῆς.

[sequuntur Archil. 4T46ab]

4T46a ibid.

[praecedit Archil. 4T45]

καὶ πάλιν·

[sequitur Archil. 4F2a.1-2]

[sequitur Archil. 4T46b]

4T46b ibid.

[praecedunt Archil. 4T45-46a]

εἶτ' ἐπιφέρει·

[sequitur Archil. 4F2a.3-6]

[sequuntur Hes. 2T41 Call. 20T16]

4T47 Σ *in Il.* (*Cod. Reg.* 3058), *s.v.* αἶνος (III 371 Cramer)

[laudatur Archil. 4F1a.2-3 (κάετὸς ξυνωνίαν ἔθεντο)]

καὶ τὰ ἑξῆς.

[sequuntur Archil. 4T48ab]

4T48a ibid.

[praecedit Archil. 4T47]

καὶ πάλιν,

[sequitur Archil. 4F2a.1-2 (Κηρυδίκη)]

[sequitur Archil. 4T48b]

4T48b ibid.

[praecedunt Archil. 4T47-48a]

εἶτ' ἐπιφέρει·

[sequitur Archil. 4F2a.3-6 (θηρίον ὑποκριθεὶς, τῶ, πυκν')]

[sequuntur Hes. 2T42 Call. 20T17]

4F1a Archil. fr. 174 West

172 πάτερ Λυκάμβα, ποῖον ἐφράσω τόδε;
τίς σὰς παρήειρε φρένας
ἧς τὸ πρὶν ἠρήρησθα; νῦν δὲ δὴ πολὺς
ἀστοῖσι φαίνεαι γέλως.

173 ὅρκον δ' ἐνοσφίσθης μέγαν
ἅλας τε καὶ τράπεζαν.

174 αἶνός τις ἀνθρώπων ὅδε,
ὡς ἆρ' ἀλώπηξ καἰετὸς ξυνεωνίην
ἔμειξαν,

4F1b ib. fr. 175

175 x — ⏑ ἐς παῖ]δας φέρων
δαῖ]ṭα δ' οὐ καλὴν ἐπ[ὶ
ὥρμησαν ἀπτ]ῆνες δύο
x — ⏑ — x]. γῆ[ς] ἐφ' ụψηλῷ π̣[άγῳ
x — ⏑ —]νεοσσιῇ
x — ⏑ —]προύθηκε, τὴν δ̣[x—⏑—
x — ⏑ —].εχο.[⏑ -
x — ⏑ —]αδε..[⏑—x—⏑—
x — ⏑ — x]φωλ̣ά̣[δ -

4F1c ib. fr. 176

176 ὁρᾷς ἵν' ἐστὶ κεῖνος ὑψηλὸς πάγος,
τρηχύς τε καὶ παλίγκοτος;
ἐν τῷ κάθηται, σὴν ἐλαφρίζων μάχην.

4F1d ib. fr. 177

177 ὦ Ζεῦ, πάτερ Ζεῦ, σὸν μὲν οὐρανοῦ κράτος,
σὺ δ' ἔργ' ἐπ' ἀνθρώπων ὁρᾷς
λεωργὰ καὶ θεμιστά, σοὶ δὲ θηρίων
ὕβρις τε καὶ δίκη μέλει.

4F1e? ib. fr. 178

178 μή τευ μελαμπύγου τύχῃς.

4F1f ib. fr. 179

179 προύθηκε παισὶ δεῖπνον αἰηνὲς φέρων.

4F1g ib. fr. 180

180 πυρὸς δ' ἐν αὐτῷ φεψάλυξ.

4F1h ib. fr. 181

181].ω̣[
]ηρκ̣[
].τάτην[
μ]έγ' ἠείδει κακ̣[όν
φ]ρέ[ν]ας
].δ' ἀ̣μήχανον τ.[
]ακον·
].α̣ν̣ων μεμνημένος[

]. ην κλύσας
κέ]λευθον ὠκέως δι' αἰθέρος[
λαιψηρὰ κυ]κλώσας πτερά
]ν ἠσ..·
σὸς δὲ θυμὸς ἔλπεται

4F2a Archil. fr. 185 West

185 ἐρέω τιν' ὔμιν αἶνον, ὦ Κηρυκίδη,
ἀχνυμένη σκυτάλη,

πίθηκος ᾔει θηρίων ἀποκριθεὶς
μοῦνος ἀν' ἐσχατιήν,
τῷ δ' ἆρ' ἀλώπηξ κερδαλῆ συνήντετο,
πυκνὸν ἔχουσα νόον.

4F2b ib. fr. 186

186 ῥόπτρῳ ἐρειδόμενον.

4F2c ib. fr. 187

187 τοιήνδε δ' ὦ πίθηκε τὴν πυγὴν ἔχων.

4F3 Archil. fr. 237 West ?

[praecedit Archil. 4T2]

πῶς ἀπέπρησε σκύτα;

5. *Semonides*

5T1 Hdn. *Περὶ ὀρθογραφίας*, p. 516 Lentz

ζῴδιον σὺν τῷ ι, ἐπειδὴ εὕρηται καὶ κατὰ διάστασιν παρὰ Σιμωνίδῃ οἷον

[sequitur Semon. 5F2.1-2 τόδ'...κάκιστον (τὸ *om.*, ζώϊον)]

καὶ διὰ τὸν χαρακτῆρα τῶν διὰ τοῦ ωον· τὰ γὰρ διὰ τοῦ ωον οὐδέτερα μονογενῆ θέλει ἔχειν τὸ ι οἷον Πτῷον ὄνομα ὄρους, προστῷον, περίστῳον, ὑπερῷον. οὕτω καὶ ζῷον σὺν τῷ ι.

5T2 Ath. 7.54, 299C

καὶ τὴν αἰτιατικήν·

[sequitur Semon. 5F1]

5T3 Σ *in Il.* 18.407*b*
ζῳάγρια· χαριστήρια τοῦ εἰς τὸ ζῆν ἦχθαι. μετὰ δὲ τοῦ ⟨ι⟩, ἐπεὶ καὶ Σιμωνίδης φησί·
[sequitur Semon. 5F2, fr. 13.2 West]
περὶ τοῦ κανθάρου.

5T4 *Et. Gen. s.v.* ζῷον [AB; p. 141 Miller]
ζῷον· ...γράφεται δὲ διὰ τοῦ 'ι', ἐπειδὴ εὕρηται κατὰ διάστασιν, ὡς παρὰ Σιμωνίδῃ· φησὶ γὰρ
[sequitur Semon. 5F2]

5T5 *EM s.v.* ζωΐδιον
Ζωΐδιον· Σὺν τῷ ἰῶτα, ἐπειδὴ εὕρηται κατὰ διάστασιν. (...) Ἢ ἐπειδή ἐστι ζῷον ζῴου, ὅπερ ἔχει προσγεγραμμένον τὶ ἰῶτα· καὶ ἐπειδὴ ἡ τελευταία συλλαβὴ τῆς γενικῆς τῶν πρωτοτύπων ἀπὸ φωνήεντος ἄρχεται, γίνεται ζωΐδιον, ὡς εἴρηται, τοῦ ι ἀπὸ τοῦ πρωτοτύπου ὄντος. Τὸ γενικὸν ὄνομα, παρὰ τὸ ζῶ, τὸ τοῦ ζῆν δεκτικόν. Ἢ ἀπὸ τῆς ζωῆς, τὸ ζωὴν ἔχον, ἢ ζέσιν ἔχον καὶ θερμότητα, πρὸς ἀντιδιαστολὴν τῶν μὴ ζώων· ὅθεν καὶ ζεστὸν ἄνθρωπόν φαμεν, τὸν εὐκίνητον καὶ θερμόν. Γράφεται δὲ μετὰ τοῦ ἰῶτα, ἐπειδὴ εὕρηται κατὰ διάστασιν καὶ παρὰ Σιμωνίδῃ, οἷον,
[sequitur Semon. 5F2.1-2 τόδ'...κάκιστον]
Καὶ διὰ τὸν χαρακτῆρα τῶν διὰ τοῦ ΩΟΝ. Τὰ γὰρ διὰ τοῦ ΩΟΝ οὐδέτερα μονογενῆ θέλει ἔχειν τὸ ἰῶτα· οἷον, Πτῷον, ὄνομα ὄρους· προστῷον, περιστῷον, ὑπερῷον. Οὕτω καὶ ζῶον σὺν τῷ ι.

5T6 Ps.-Zonar. *Lex. s.v.* Ζῷον
ζῷον παρὰ τὸ ζῶ, ἢ ἀπὸ τῆς ζωῆς. γράφεται δὲ διὰ τοῦ ι, ἐπειδὴ εὕρηται κατὰ διάστασιν, ὡς παρὰ Σιμωνίδῃ. φησὶ γάρ·
[sequitur Semon. 5F2]
καὶ διὰ τὸν χαρακτῆρα τὸν διὰ τοῦ ωον· τὰ γὰρ διὰ τοῦ ωον οὐδέτερα μονογενῆ θέλουσιν ἔχειν πάντοτε τὸ ι. οἷον· Πτῷον, ὄνομα ὄρους, περιστῷον, προστῷον, ὑπερῷον. οὕτως οὖν τὸ ζῶον σὺν τῷ ἰῶτα.

5F1 Semon. fr. 9 West
[praecedit Semon. 5T1]
ἐρῳδιὸς γὰρ ἔγχελυν Μαιανδρίην
τρίορχον εὑρὼν ἐσθίοντ' ἀπείλετο.

5F2 Semon. fr. 13 West ?
τὸ δ' ἥμιν ἑρπετὸν παρέπτατο
τὸ ζωΐων κάκιστον ἔκτηται βίον.

6. *Scolia*

6T1 Ath. 15.50, 694E
[laudatur *Scol.* 6A1]

6T2 Ath. 15.50, 695A
[laudatur *Scol.* 6F1]

6T3a Eust. *Od.* η 125, p. 1574
μυρία δὲ τοιαῦτα περιφέρονται [sc. σκόλια]. τὰ μέν, σκωπτικά. τὰ δέ, πρὸς ἔρωτα. πολλὰ δέ, καὶ σπουδαῖα. ἐν οἷς καὶ τὸ παιδεῦον ὀρθότητα φιλικήν, ἔχον οὕτως.

[sequitur *Scol.* 6F1]

ἤγουν

καρκίνος χηλῇ τὸν ὄφιν συσχών, εἶπεν ὡς ὀρθὸν χρὴ τὸν φίλον εἶναι καὶ μὴ σκολιόφρονα.

[sequitur *Scol.* 6T3b]

6T3b ibid.

[praecedit *Scol.* 6T3a]

παίδευσιν δὲ κἀκεῖνο τὸ σκόλιον ἔχει.

[sequitur *Scol.* 6A1]

αὐτὸ δὲ χρηστὸν μέν ἐστιν εἰς τὴν Ἀχιλλέως γνώμην ὃς ὁμῶς ἀΐδω πύλησιν ἄνδρα ἐχθαίρει ἕτερα μὲν κεύθοντα ἐν φρεσὶν ἄλλα δὲ βάζοντα. ὥρμηται δὲ ἀπὸ Αἰσωπείου μύθου. ἐν ᾧ

μέμφεται ὁ Μῶμος τὸν Προμηθέα, ὅτι πλάσας ἄνθρωπον, μὴ προσέπλασε τῷ στήθει καὶ πύλας, ὥστε ἀνοιγομένων αὐτῶν, βλέπεσθαι τὰς φρένας αὐτοῦ. ἀλλ' ἀφῆκε κρυψίφρονα εἶναι.

6F1 *Scol.* 9, fr. 892 *PMG*

ὁ δὲ καρκίνος ὧδ' ἔφα
χαλᾷ τὸν ὄφιν λαβών·
εὐθὺν χρὴ τὸν ἑταῖρον ἔμ-
  μεν καὶ μὴ σκολιὰ φρονεῖν.

6A1 *Scol.* 6, fr. 889 *PMG*

εἴθ' ἐξῆν ὁποῖός τις ἦν ἕκαστος
τὸ στῆθος διελόντ', ἔπειτα τὸν νοῦν
ἐσιδόντα, κλείσαντα πάλιν,
ἄνδρα φίλον νομίζειν ἀδόλῳ φρενί.

7. *Stesichorus*

7T1 Arist. *Rh.* 2.20, 1393b8-22

[praecedit Arist. G5]

...ὁ Στησιχόρου περὶ Φαλάριδος καὶ ⟨ὁ⟩ Αἰσώπου ὑπὲρ τοῦ δημαγωγοῦ. Στησίχορος μὲν γὰρ ἑλομένων στρατηγὸν αὐτοκράτορα τῶν Ἱμεραίων Φάλαριν καὶ μελλόντων φυλακὴν διδόναι τοῦ σώματος, τἆλλα διαλεχθεὶς εἶπεν αὐτοῖς λόγον ὡς

ἵππος κατεῖχε λειμῶνα μόνος, ἐλθόντος δ' ἐλάφου καὶ διαφθείροντος τὴν νομὴν βουλόμενος τιμωρήσασθαι τὸν ἔλαφον ἠρώτα τινὰ ἄνθρωπον εἰ δύναιτ' ἂν μετ' αὐτοῦ τιμωρήσασθαι τὸν ἔλαφον, ὁ δ' ἔφησεν, ἐὰν λάβῃ χαλινὸν καὶ αὐτὸς ἀναβῇ ἐπ' αὐτὸν ἔχων ἀκόντια· συνομολογήσας δὲ καὶ ἀναβάντος ἀντὶ τοῦ τιμωρήσασθαι αὐτὸς ἐδούλευσε τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ.

"οὕτω δὲ καὶ ὑμεῖς", ἔφη, "ὁρᾶτε μὴ βουλόμενοι τοὺς πολεμίους τιμωρήσασθαι τὸ αὐτὸ πάθητε τῷ ἵππῳ· τὸν μὲν γὰρ χαλινὸν ἔχετε ἤδη, ἑλόμενοι στρατηγὸν αὐτοκράτορα· ἐὰν δὲ φυλακὴν δῶτε καὶ ἀναβῆναι ἐάσητε, δουλεύσετε ἤδη Φαλάριδι."

[sequitur Arist. 39F2]

7T2 Crates Perg. *ap.* Ael. *NA* 17.37

[praecedit Stesich. 7T4]

λέγει δὲ Κράτης ὁ Περγαμηνὸς ὑπὲρ τούτων καὶ τὸν Στησίχορον ᾄδειν ἔν τινι ποιήματι οὐκ ἐκφοιτήσαντί που ἐς πολλοὺς σεμνόν τε καὶ ἀρχαῖον ὥς γε κρίνειν ἐμὲ τὸν μάρτυρα ἐσαγαγών.

7T3 Conon, *FGrHist*26F1(*Narr.*).42

[*ap.* Stesich. 7T6 (Phot.)]

1 Αἶνος. ἡ μβ—· ὡς Γέλων ὁ Σικελιώτης τυραννίδι ἐπιθέσθαι διανοούμενος Ἱμεραίων ἐθεράπευε τὸν δῆμον καὶ κατὰ τῶν δυνατῶν ὑπερεμάχει· καὶ αὐτὸν ἠγάπα τὸ πλῆθος καὶ φυλακὴν τοῦ σώματος αἰτοῦντι ὡρμᾶτο διδόναι. Στησίχορος δ' ὁ Ἱμεραῖος ποιητὴς ὑποτοπήσας ἐπιχειρεῖν αὐτὸν τυραννίδι, στὰς αἶνον ἔλεξεν εἰς τὸ πλῆθος εἰκόνα τοῦ μέλλοντος πάθους.

2 ἵππος (φησί) νεμόμενος ἐφοίτα πιούμενος ἐπὶ κρήνην, ἔλαφος δὲ τὸ πεδίον διαθέουσα τήν τε πόαν κατέστειβε καὶ τὸ νᾶμα ἐτάραττε. καὶ ὁ ἵππος ποθῶν τὴν ἀδικοῦσαν τιμωρῆσαι, τάχει δὲ ποδῶν λειπόμενος, ἄνδρα κυνηγέτην βοηθὸν ἐκάλει· ὁ δέ, εἰ χαλινὸν δέξοιτο καὶ ἀναβάτην, ῥᾷστα ἀμύνειν αὐτῷ ὑπισχνεῖτο. καὶ ἐγίνετο οὕτως. καὶ ἡ μὲν ἔλαφος ἀκοντίοις ἔκειτο βληθεῖσα, ὁ δ' ἵππος ᾔσθετο δεδουλωμένος τῷ κυνηγέτῃ.

τοῦτ' (ἔφη) δέδοικα καὶ αὐτός, ὦ Ἱμεραῖοι, μὴ νῦν δῆμος ὄντες τῶν ἐχθρῶν μὲν διὰ Γέλωνος περιγένησθε, αὐτοὶ δ' ὕστερον Γέλωνι δου-

λεύσητε· φιλεῖν γὰρ ἅπασαν τὴν δύναμιν τῷ λαβόντι ἐπὶ τὸν δόντα εἶναι, ὅταν ὥσπερ δοῦναι αὐτὴν μηκέτι ἐκ τοῦ ὁμοίου κομίσασθαι ἔχῃ.

7T4 Ael. *NA* 17.37

ἀμῶντες ἄνθρωποι τὸν ἀριθμὸν ἑκκαίδεκα τοῦ ἡλίου καταφλέγοντος δίψει πιεζόμενοι ἕνα ἑαυτῶν ἀπέστειλαν ἐκ πηγῆς γειτνιώσης κομίσαι ὕδωρ. οὐκοῦν ὁ ἀπιὼν τὸ μὲν δρέπανον τὸ ἀμητικὸν διὰ χειρὸς εἶχε, τὸ δὲ ἀρυστικὸν ἀγγεῖον κατὰ τοῦ ὤμου ἔφερεν. ἐλθὼν δὲ καταλαμβάνει ἀετὸν ὑπό τινος ὄφεως ἐγκρατῶς τε καὶ εὐλαβῶς περιπλακέντα. ἔτυχε δὲ ἄρα καταπτὰς μὲν ἐπ' αὐτὸν ὁ ἀετός, οὐ μὴν τῆς ἐπιβουλῆς ἐγκρατὴς ἐγένετο, οὐδέ, τοῦτο δὴ τὸ Ὁμηρικόν, τοῖς ἑαυτοῦ τέκνοις τὴν δαῖτα ἐκόμισεν, ἀλλὰ τοῖς ἐκείνου περιπεσὼν ἕρμασιν ἔμελλεν οὐ μὰ Δί' ἀπολεῖν ἀλλ' ἀπολεῖσθαι. εἰδὼς οὖν ὁ γεωργὸς τὸν μὲν εἶναι Διὸς ἄγγελον καὶ ὑπηρέτην, εἰδώς γε μὴν κακὸν θηρίον τὸν ὄφιν, τῷ δρεπάνῳ τῇ προειρημένῳ διακόπτει τὸν θῆρα, καὶ μέντοι καὶ τῶν ἀφύκτων ἐκείνων εἰργμῶν τε καὶ δεσμῶν τὸν ἀετὸν ἀπολύει. ὁδοῦ μέντοι πάρεργον τῷ ἀνδρὶ ταῦτα καὶ δὴ διεπέπρακτο, ἀρυσάμενος δὲ τὸ ὕδωρ ἧκε καὶ πρὸς τὸν οἶνον κεράσας ὤρεξε πᾶσιν, οἱ δὲ ἄρα ἔπιον καὶ ἀμυστὶ καὶ πολλὰς ἐπὶ τῷ ἀρίστῳ. ἔμελλε δὲ καὶ αὐτὸς ἐπ' ἐκείνοις πίεσθαι· ἔτυχε γάρ πως ὑπηρέτης κατ' ἐκεῖνο τοῦ καιροῦ ἀλλ' οὐ συμπότης ὤν. ἐπεὶ δὲ τοῖς χείλεσι τὴν κύλικα προσῆγεν, ὁ σωθεὶς ἀετὸς ζωάγρια ἐκτίνων οἱ καὶ κατὰ τύχην ἀγαθὴν ἐκείνου ἔτι διατρίβων περὶ τὸν χῶρον ἐμπίπτει τῇ κύλικι καὶ ἐκταράττει αὐτὴν καὶ ἐκχεῖ τὸ πότον. ὁ δὲ ἠγανάκτησεν, καὶ γὰρ ἔτυχε διψῶν, καὶ λέγει· εἶτα μέντοι σὺ ἐκεῖνος ὢν—καὶ γὰρ τὸν ὄρνιν ἐγνώρισε—τοιαύτας ἀποδίδως τοῖς σωτῆρσι τὰς χάριτας; ἀλλὰ πῶς ἔτι ταῦτα καλά; πῶς δ' ἂν καὶ ἄλλος σπουδὴν καταθέσθαι θελήσειεν ἔς τινα αἰδοῖ Διὸς χαρίτων ἐφόρου τε καὶ ἐπόπτου; καὶ τῷ μὲν ταῦτα εἴρητο, καὶ ἐφρύγετο· ὁρᾷ δὲ ἐπιστραφεὶς τοὺς πίοντας ἀσπαίροντάς τε καὶ ἀποθνήσκοντας. ἦν δὲ ἄρα ὡς συμβαλεῖν ἐμημεκὼς ἐς τὴν πηγὴν ὁ ὄφις καὶ κεράσας αὐτὴν τῷ ἰῷ. ὁ μὲν οὖν ἀετὸς τῷ σώσαντι ἰσότιμον τῆς σωτηρίας ἀπέδωκε τὸν μισθόν.

[sequitur 7T2]

7T5a anon. *in Rh.* 2.20, 1393b8 (p. 125 Rabe)

λόγος δέ ἐστιν ἤτοι μῦθος, οἷός ἐστιν

ὁ τοῦ Στησιχόρου· τῶν γὰρ Ἱμεραίων ἑλομένων τὸν Φάλαριν στρατηγὸν ἐζήτει ὁ Φάλαρις στρατιώτας χάριν φυλακῆς.

[sequitur 7T5b]

7T5b ib. b17

[praecedit Stesich. 7T5a]

συνομολογήσαντος δὲ ἤτοι θελήσαντος τοῦ ἐλάφου, ὡς ἂν ἐπιβῇ ‑

[sequuntur Arist. 39T2ab]

7T6 Phot. *Bibl.* 186, 139b

[laudatur Stesich. 7T3 (Conon)]

7T7 Arist. Lat. *anon.*

Sermo autem, qualis fuit Stisigori de Phalaride et Esopi de duce. Stisigorus quidem enim eligentibus Imereis Phalarim pretorem et rectorem et debentibus custodiam tradere corporis, alia disputans dixit eis sermonem quia

equus habebat pratum solus, superveniente vero cervo et destruente pascua volens equus tormentare cervum interrogabat quendam hominem si posset cum ipso affligere cervum; qui vero dixit, si accipiat frenum et ipse ascendat super ipsum habens telum; ipso autem consentiente et illo ascendente causa tormentandi ipse servivit homini. 'Sic autem et nos,' dixit, 'videte volentes hostes affligi ne patiamur idem quod equus; frenum enim habetis utique, eligentes pretorem regentem; si vero custodiam dederitis et ascendere permiseritis, servietis utique Phalaridi.'

[sequitur Arist. 39T3b]

7T8 Arist. Lat. *Guil.*

Fabula autem, qualis que Stesichori ad Falaridem et Esopi de rectore populi. Stesichorus quidem enim eligentibus Imereis ducem exercitus imperatorem Falarim et daturis cautelam corporis. cum alia disseruisset, dixit eis fabulam quomodo

equus optinebat pratum solus, adveniente autem cervo et corrumpente pascua volens punire cervum interrogabat hominem si posset cum ipso punire cervum; ille autem ait, si acceperit frenum et ipse ascenderit super eum habens lanceam; cum consensisset autem et ascendisset pro eo ut puniret, ipse servivit iam homini. 'Ita autem et vos,' ait, 'videte ne volentes adversarios punire idem patiamini cum equo; frenum quidem enim habetis iam, eligentes ducem exercitus imperatorem; si autem cautelam dederitis et supergredi siveritis, servietis iam Falaridi.'

[sequitur Arist. 39T4b]

7T9 Abst. *Praef.* (p. 534 Neveletus)

Himerenses Phalaridem Agrigentinorum tyrannum ducem exercitus sui eligere volentes, Stesichorus poeta hoc apologo deterruit.

Equus, dicens, solus pascebat in prato. Adueniente autem ceruo, & pascua corrumpente, consulit hominem, qua posset illum arte punire. Cui homo, si frenum, inquit, acceperis, & me armatum dorsum tuum ascendere permiseris. Cum huic consilio esset obsecutus, ceruum quidem hominis auxilio victor abegit, sed non amplius hominem dorso, non frenum depulit ore.

Ita, inquit Stesichorus viri Himerenses vobis eueniet, si Phalaridem ducem efficietis, hostes quidem vestros punietis, sed huic tyranno perpetuo seruietis. Quibus verbis territi Himerenses, huiusmodi ducis eligendi consilium deposuere.
[sequuntur Hes. 2T43 Pl. 49T14 Arist. 52T1]

7F1 Stesich. 103, fr. 280 *PMG*
[= Stesich. 7T4+3]

7F2 Stesich. 104 (a), fr. 281 *PMG*
[= Stesich. 7T1 (cf. 2)]

8. *Ibycus*

8T1 Chrysipp. Stoic. fr. 180.14 *SVF*
εἰ οὐ ἀντίκειται ἀξίωμα καταφατικὸν τῷ·
[sequitur Ibyc. 8F1]
οὐκ [ὁ] Ἴβυκος ὁ ποιητὴς οὕτως ἀ(πε)φαίνετ(ο)·
[sequitur Ibyc. 8F1]
ναὶ οὐ ἀντίκειται ἀξίωμα καταφατικὸν τῷ·
[sequitur Ibyc. 8F1]
ναὶ οὐ Ἴβυκος ὁ ποιητὴς οὕτως ἀπεφαίνετο·
[sequitur Ibyc. 8F1]

8T2 Ael. *NA* 6.51
51 Κατηγορεῖ τῆς διψάδος τὸ ἔργον αὐτὸ ἡμῖν τὸ ὄνομα. καὶ ἔχεως μέν ἐστιν ὀλιγωτέρα μέγεθος, ἀποκτεῖναι δὲ ὀξυτέρα· οἱ γάρ τοι τῷ δήγματι προσπεσόντες ἐξάπτονταί τε ἐς δίψος καὶ πιεῖν ἀναφλέγονται καὶ ἀμυστὶ σπῶσι καὶ τάχιστα ῥήγνυνται. καί φησι μὲν Σώστρατος λευκὴν εἶναι τὴν διψάδα, ἐπί γε μὴν τῆς οὐρᾶς ἔχειν γραμμὰς μελαίνας δύο. ἀκούω δὲ ὅτι καὶ πρηστῆρας αὐτὰς καλοῦσί τινες, καύσωνας δὲ ἄλλοι· ὄχλον δὲ ἄρα ὀνομάτων ἐπαντλοῦσι τῷδε τῷ θηρίῳ. κέκληται δὲ καὶ μελάνουρος, ὥς φασι, καὶ ἀμμοβάτης· εἰ δὲ ἀκούσειας κεντρίδα, τὴν αὐτήν μοι λέγεσθαι νόει. δεῖ δὲ καὶ μῦθον τῷδε τῷ ζῴῳ ἐπᾷσαί με ὅνπερ οὖν ἀκούσας οἶδα, ὡς ἂν μὴ δοκοίην ἀμαθῶς ἔχειν αὐτοῦ.

τὸν Προμηθέα κλέψαι τὸ πῦρ ἡ φήμη φησί, καὶ τὸν Δία ἀγανακτῆσαι ὁ μῦθος λέγει καὶ τοῖς καταμηνύσασι τὴν κλοπὴν δοῦναι φάρμακον γήρως ἀμυντήριον. τοῦτο οὖν ἐπὶ ὄνῳ θεῖναι τοὺς λαβόντας πέπυσμαι. καὶ τὸν μὲν προιέναι τὸ ἄχθος φέροντα. εἶναι δὲ ὥραν θέρειον, καὶ διψῶντα τὸν ὄνον ἐπί τινα κρήνην κατὰ τὴν τοῦ ποτοῦ χρείαν ἐλθεῖν. τὸν οὖν ὄφιν τὸν φυλάττοντα ἀναστέλλειν αὐτὸν καὶ ἀπελαύνειν, καὶ ἐκεῖνον στρεβλούμενον μισθόν οἱ τῆς φιλοτησίας δοῦναι ὅπερ οὖν ἔτυχε φέρων φάρμα-

κον. οὐκοῦν ἀντίδοσις γίνεται, καὶ ὁ μὲν πίνει, ὁ δὲ τὸ γῆρας ἀποδύεται, προσεπιλαβὼν ὡς λόγος τὸ τοῦ ὄνου δίψος.

τί οὖν; ἐγὼ τοῦ μύθου ποιητής; ἀλλ' οὐκ ἂν εἴποιμι, ἐπεὶ καὶ πρὸ ἐμοῦ Σοφοκλῆς ὁ τῆς τραγῳδίας ποιητὴς καὶ Δεινόλοχος ὁ ἀνταγωνιστὴς Ἐπιχάρμου καὶ Ἴβυκος ὁ Ῥηγῖνος καὶ Ἀριστίας καὶ Ἀπολλοφάνης ποιηταὶ κωμῳδίας ᾄδουσιν αὐτόν [sc. τὸν μῦθον].

8F1 Ibyc. 61, fr. 342 *PMG*

[vide Ibyc. 8T2]

Ibyc. 32, fr. 313 *PMG* (?)

[praecedit Ibyc. 8T1]

...οὐκ ἔστιν ἀποφθιμένοις ζωᾶς ἔτι φάρμακον εὑρεῖν,...

[pergit testimonium]

9. *Simonides*

9T1 Ps.-Diogenian. *Praef.* (p. 179 Leutsch-Schneidewin)

[praecedit Timocr. 10T2]

...καὶ Σιμωνίδης δ' αὐτοῦ [sc. τοῦ λόγου τούτου] μνημονεύει ἐν τῷ εἰς Ὄριλλαν Ἐπινικίῳ.

[sequitur Ps.-Diogenian. G28]

9T2 Ath. 7.107, 318F

Δωριεῖς δ' αὐτὸν διὰ τοῦ ω καλοῦσι πώλυπον, ὡς Ἐπίχαρμος. καὶ Σιμωνίδης δ' ἔφη·

[sequitur Simon. 9F1]

Ἀττικοὶ δὲ πουλύπουν.

9T3 *Cod. Paris. suppl. gr.* 676 (p. 79 Cohn)

ὁ Κάριος αἶνος· μέμνηται ταύτης Σιμωνίδης ἐπαινῶν τινα ἡνίοχον νικήσαντα ἐν Πελλήνῃ καὶ λαβόντα ἐπινίκιον χλαμύδα, ᾧ χρησάμενος ἀπηλλάγη τοῦ ῥίγους· χειμῶνος ⟨1-2 vocc. illeg.⟩ ἐν Πελλήνῃ ἐπετελεῖτο. φασὶ δὲ ὅτι

ἁλιεὺς ἰδὼν ἐν χειμῶνι πολύποδα εἶπεν· εἰ μὴ κολυμβήσω, πεινήσω.

τοῦτον οὖν εἶναι τὸν Κάριον αἶνον.

9F1 Simon. 9, fr. 514 *PMG*

[praecedit Simon. 9T2]

πώλυπον διζήμενος.

10. *Timocreon*

10T1 Plu. *Them.* 21.7

λέγεται δ' ὁ Τιμοκρέων ἐπὶ μηδισμῷ φυγεῖν συγκαταψηφισαμένου τοῦ Θεμιστοκλέους. ὡς οὖν ὁ Θεμιστοκλῆς αἰτίαν ἔσχε μηδίζειν, ταῦτ' ἐποίησεν εἰς αὐτόν·

[sequitur Timocr. 10A1]

10T2 Ps.-Diogenian. *Praef.* (p. 179 Leutsch-Schneidewin)

[praecedit Ps.-Diogenian. G28]

...· τοῦτον [*sc.* Κᾶρα ἄνδρα] γὰρ ἁλιέα τυγχάνοντα χειμῶνος θεασαμένον πολύποδα εἰπεῖν· "Εἰ μὲν ἀποδὺς κολυμβήσαιμι ἐπ' αὐτὸν ῥιγώσω, ἐὰν δὲ μὴ λάβω τὸν πολύποδα, τῷ λιμῷ τὰ παιδί' ἀπολῶ."

Κέχρηται δὲ τῷ λόγῳ τούτῳ καὶ Τιμοκρέων ἐν μέλεσι,...

[sequitur Simon. 9T1]

10T3 Ps.-Diogenian. *Praef.* (p. 180 Leutsch-Schneidewin)

[praecedit Ps.-Diogenian. G28]

Κέχρηται δὲ καὶ τούτῳ Τιμοκρέων ἐμφαίνων ὡς οἱ ἄδικα πράσσοντες καὶ ἐς ὕστερον τῶν προσηκόντων τυγχάνουσι. Καὶ γὰρ

τῷ Ἀδώνιδι ἐν Κύπρῳ τιμηθέντι ὑπὸ τῆς Ἀφροδίτης μετὰ τὴν τελευτὴν οἱ Κύπριοι ζώσας ἐνίεσαν περιστεράς, αἱ δ' ἀποπτᾶσαι καὶ διαφυγοῦσαι αὖθις ἀδοκήτως εἰς ἄλλην ἐμπεσοῦσαι πυρὰν διεφθάρησαν.

[pergit testimonium]

10T4 anon. Περὶ αἴνου (p. 154.13-25 Bartoletti)

[praecedit anon. G39]

κέχρη[ται δὲ τού-]
[τῳ] Τιμοκρέων ἐν [ᾄσματι κατὰ]
[Θε]μιστοκλ[έο]υς ἐκ[πεσόν-]
[τος] ἐκ τῆς [Ἑλ]λάδος ἐ[φη-]
[δό]μενος αὐτοῦ τῇ φ[υγῇ· οὕτω]
[δὲ λέ]γει·

[sequitur Timocr. 10F1]

10T5 Zen., *cod. Mon.* 525 (I 166 Bühler)

[laudatur Timocr. 10A1.3-5]

ἀλώπεκα λαβὼν νεανίας ἔν τινι χώρῳ καὶ τὴν οὐρὰν ἀφελὼν εἴασεν. ἡ δ' αἰσχυνομένη οὐ προῄει, μέχρι καὶ ἄλλας ἐθεάσατο τὸ αὐτὸ πεπονθυίας ὑπὸ τοῦ νεανίσκου· τότε παρορ{μ}ῶσα αὐτὴν προῆλθεν.

10T6 Apostol. 7.28
[laudatur Timocr. 10A1.3-5]

10T7 Arsen. 23.62
[idem atque Timocr. 10T6]

10F1 Timocr. 4, fr. 730 *PMG*
[praecedit Timocr. 10T4]
λό[γ]ον δέ σοι λε̣[
. . .] . ον ταυτ̣ὰ̣ σοι π . . [
. . τ]ῶν τριῶν τ̣αλ[άντων
. . . .]ων ξένος[

10F2 Timocr. 8, fr. 734 *PMG*
[= Timocr. 10T2]

10A1 Timocr. 3 (fr. 729 *PMG*).4-5
[praecedit Timocr. 10T1]
οὐκ ἆρα Τιμοκρέων μόνος
Μήδοισιν ὀρκιατομεῖ·
ἀλλ' ἐντὶ κἄλλοι δὴ πονη-
ροὶ
κοὐκ ἐγὼ μόνα κόλου-
ρις· ἐντὶ κἄλλαι 'λώπεκες.

11. *Aristias*

11T1 Ael. *NA* 6.51
[vide Ibyc. 8T2]

11F1 *TragGrF* I(Snell)9F8
[μῦθος περὶ ὄνου διψῶντος]

12. *Aeschylus*

12T1 Ar. *Av.* 807-808
[vide Ar. 17A4]

12T2 Ar. *Ra.* 1431-1432
[vide Ar. 17A6]

12T3 D.H. *Dem.* 7

[praecedit Pl. *Phdr.* 238d]

[sequitur A. 12F1.4-5 [⟨τάδ' οὐχ ὑ⟩π' ἄλλων ἀλλὰ τοῖς αὑτῶν λόγοις ἁλισκόμεσθα]]

⟨κατὰ τὴν τραγῳδί⟩αν, δαιμονιώτατε Πλάτων, διθυράμβων ψόφους καὶ λήρους ἠγαπηκότες.

12T4 Ph. *Aet. M.* 49

48 Χρύσιππος γοῦν ὁ δοκιμώτατος τῶν παρ' αὐτοῖς ἐν τοῖς Περὶ αὐξανομένου τερατεύεταί τι τοιοῦτον· προκατασκευάσας ὅτι "δύο ἰδίως ποιὰ ἐπὶ τῆς αὐτῆς οὐσίας ἀμήχανον συστῆναι", φησίν· "ἔστω θεωρίας ἕνεκα τὸν μέν τινα ὁλόκληρον, τὸν δὲ χωρὶς ἐπινοεῖσθαι τοῦ ἑτέρου ποδός, καλεῖσθαι δὲ τὸν μὲν ὁλόκληρον Δίωνα, τὸν δὲ ἀτελῆ Θέωνα, κἄπειτα ἀποτέμνεσθαι Δίωνος τὸν ἕτερον τοῖν ποδοῖν." ζητουμένου δή, πότερος ἔφθαρται, τὸν Θέωνα φάσκειν οἰκειότερον εἶναι. τοῦτο δὲ δοξολογοῦντος μᾶλλόν ἐστιν ἢ ἀληθεύοντος. 49 πῶς γὰρ ὁ μὲν οὐδὲν ἀκρωτηριασθεὶς μέρος, ὁ Θέων, ἀνήρπασται, ὁ δ' ἀποκοπεὶς τὸν πόδα Δίων οὐχὶ διέφθαρται; "δεόντως" φησίν· "ἀναδεδράμηκε γὰρ ὁ ἐκτμηθεὶς τὸν πόδα Δίων ἐπὶ τὴν ἀτελῆ τοῦ Θέωνος οὐσίαν, καὶ δύο ἰδίως ποιὰ περὶ τὸ αὐτὸ ὑποκείμενον οὐ δύνατ' εἶναι. τοιγαροῦν τὸν μὲν Δίωνα μένειν ἀναγκαῖον, τὸν δὲ Θέωνα διεφθάρθαι."

[sequitur A. 12F1.4-5 (5: ἁλισκόμενα)]

φησὶν ὁ τραγικός· ἀπομαξάμενος γάρ τις τὸν τύπον τοῦ λόγου καὶ ἐφαρμόσας τῷ παντὶ κόσμῳ δείξει σαφέστατα καὶ αὐτὴν φθειρομένην τὴν πρόνοιαν. 50 σκόπει δ' ὧδε· ὑποκείσθω τὸ μὲν ὡσανεὶ Δίων ὁ κόσμος - τέλειος γάρ-, τὸ δὲ ὡσανεὶ Θέων ἡ τοῦ κόσμου ψυχή, διότι τοῦ ὅλου τὸ μέρος ἔλαττον, καὶ ἀφαιρείσθω, ὥσπερ ἀπὸ τοῦ Δίωνος ὁ πούς, οὕτως καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ κόσμου ὅσον αὐτοῦ σωματοειδές. 51 οὐκοῦν ἀνάγκη λέγειν ὅτι ὁ μὲν κόσμος οὐκ ἔφθαρται ὁ τὸ σῶμα ἀφαιρεθείς, ὥσπερ οὐδὲ ὁ ἀποκοπεὶς τὸν πόδα Δίων, ἀλλ' ἡ τοῦ κόσμου ψυχή, ὥσπερ Θέων ὁ μηδὲν παθών. ὁ μὲν γὰρ κόσμος ἐπ' ἐλάττονα οὐσίαν ἀνέδραμεν, ἀφαιρεθέντος αὐτῷ τοῦ σωματοειδοῦς, ἐφθάρη δ' ἡ ψυχὴ διὰ τὸ μὴ δύνασθαι δύο ἰδίως ποιὰ εἶναι περὶ τὸ αὐτὸ ὑποκείμενον. ἔκθεσμον δὲ τὸ λέγειν φθείρεσθαι τὴν πρόνοιαν· ἀφθάρτου δὲ ὑπαρχούσης, ἀνάγκη καὶ τὸν κόσμον ἄφθαρτον εἶναι.

12T5 Plu. *Alc.* 16.3

[vide Ar. 17T5]

12T6 Ps.-Diogenian. *Praef.* (p. 180 Leutsch-Schneidewin)

[praecedit Ps.-Diogenian. G28]

...Αἰσχύλος διασαφεῖ,

[sequitur A. 12F1.1]

12T7 Aristid. *Or.* 2.55 (p. 161 Behr)

53 Εἰ τοίνυν, ὦ Ζεῦ καὶ θεοί, μανία τίς ἐστιν ἀμείνων σωφροσύνης καὶ παρὰ θεῶν ἀνθρώποις γιγνομένη, πῶς ἄξιον πᾶν γε τὸ μὴ τέχνῃ γιγνόμενον ψέγειν, ἢ πῶς ῥητορικὴν ἁπλῶς αἰσχρὸν ἡγεῖσθαι; 54 εἰ δὲ δὴ τὴν μὲν καλλίστην τῶν τεχνῶν προσείρηκεν τῷ μανικὴν εἶναι, τὴν δ' ἁπλῶς οὐδ' εἶναι τέχνην, τὴν ποιητικήν, ἀλλ' ἐπίπνοιαν ἐκ Μουσῶν, ὃς δ' ἂν ἄνευ μανίας Μουσῶν ἐπὶ ποιητικὰς θύρας ἀφίκηται, πεισθεὶς ὡς ἄρα ἐκ τέχνης ἱκανὸς ποιητὴς ἐσόμενος, ἀτελὴς αὐτός τε καὶ ἡ ποίησις ὑπὸ τῆς τῶν μαινομένων ἡ τοῦ σωφρονοῦντος ἠφανίσθη, πῶς οὐκ ἐξ ἀμφοῖν δείκνυται τὸ μὴ τὴν τέχνην νικᾶν, ἀλλ' ἔστιν οὗ καὶ λαμπρότερον καὶ θεοφιλέστερον εἶναι τὸ μὴ δουλεῦον τέχνῃ; σαφῶς γὰρ οὑτωσὶ Πλάτων ἤδη διορίζεται τὸ μὴ δεῖν ἐπὶ τῶν μεγίστων τέχνην ζητεῖν. 55 ὥστ' εἰ μὲν βούλει, τὸ τοῦ Εὐριπίδου καὶ τῶν αὐτοῦ νὴ Δία συμβαίνει, σοῦ τάδε, οὐκ ἐμοῦ κλύεις, ὦ τοσοῦτον ἐνθυμηθείς· εἰ δ' αὖ βούλει, τὸ τοῦ Αἰσχύλου,

τάδ' οὐχ ὑπὸ ἄλλων, ἀλλὰ τοῖς αὐτοῦ πτεροῖς, ἃ θρυλεῖς ἐν ἐκείνοις τοῖς λόγοις, ἁλίσκῃ.

56 καὶ μὴν εἰ μαντικὴν μὲν ἐξ Ἀπόλλωνος ἢ καὶ Διός, τελετὰς δὲ ἐξ ἄλλου του θεῶν τίθῃς, ποιητικὴν δ' ἐκ Μουσῶν, οὐδ' ὁ τῶν μὲν ἀδελφός, τοῦ δὲ παῖς Ἑρμῆς ἀπορήσει λόγων περὶ τῆς ἑαυτοῦ δωρεᾶς, ἀλλ' αὐτῷ τε καὶ τῷ πατρὶ προστιθεὶς τοὺς λόγους ἀληθῆ τε καὶ δίκαια ἐρεῖ. 57 οἶμαι δὲ καὶ οἱ λογίους τούτους προσειπόντες τοὺς θεοὺς, καὶ παλαιοὶ καὶ νέοι, καὶ οὐδὲ περὶ ἓν γράμμα διενεχθέντες, πολλῷ σαφέστερον ἢ περὶ μανίας μαρτυροῦσιν ὅτι εἰς ἀξιόχρεως ἀνοίσομεν, ἄν τι μετῇ λόγων ἡμῖν, εἰ καὶ μηδεμιᾷ προσφύγοιμεν τέχνῃ.

12T8 Gal. *Plac. Hipp. et Pl.* 4.5.17

15 "ὑπερβαίνουσα", φησί, "τὸν λόγον ἡ ὁρμὴ καὶ παρὰ τοῦτον ἀθρόως φερομένη" τὴν κατὰ τὸ πάθος ἔκφορον ἀπεργάζεται κίνησιν. οὔκουν ὁ λόγος αἴτιος ὦ Χρύσιππε τῆς ἐκφόρου τε καὶ ἀμέτρου κινήσεως. 16 αὐτὸς γὰρ ὁμολογεῖς αὐτὴν γίνεσθαι παρὰ τὸν λόγον· οὐκ ἐγχωρεῖ δ' ἅμα τε παρὰ τὸν λόγον γίνεσθαί τι καὶ ὑπὸ τοῦ λόγου· πάντως δ' ὑπό τινος αἰτίας· οὐκ ἔστι δ' ἐκείνη λογική· ἄλογος ἄρα τις ἡ τὸ πάθος ἐργαζομένη δύναμις. 17 καὶ

[sequitur A. 12F1.4-5],

καίτοι γ' ἐνὸν ἡμῖν λέγειν, ὦ γενναιότατε Χρύσιππε, δυοῖν θάτερον, ἢ ὡς οὐδὲν διαφέρει πάθος ἁμαρτήματος ἢ ὡς ἐπιγίνεται τοῖς ἁμαρτήμασι τὰ πάθη· τούτων γὰρ ὁποτερονοῦν εἰπόντες οὐκ ἂν ἠναγκαζόμεθα τὴν αἰτίαν ἀποκρίνεσθαι τῆς παρὰ τὸν λόγον ἀμέτρου κινήσεως.

12T9 Ael. fr. 22 Hercher

καὶ τὸ μὲν ἐπιτήδευμα ἦν ῥήτωρ, Διοπείθης τὸ ὄνομα.

καὶ ἐνέκειντο αὐτῷ, τὴν ἐξ αὐτοῦ προφέροντες καὶ προσείοντες ὡς εἰπεῖν Γοργόνα, καὶ τοῦτον κατεσίγασαν, τὴν ἄλλως πρόλαλον ὄντα καὶ ἰταμόν. λέγει δὲ περὶ Διοπείθους τοῦ Ἀθηναίου, ὃς νόμον εἰσάγει τὸν ἀπὸ τοῦ ἄστεος ἐν Πειραιεῖ μείναντα τοῦτον τεθνάναι. οὗτος οὖν ὠψίσ-

θη ποτὲ ἄκων, καὶ κατέμεινεν ἐν τῷ Πειραιεῖ, καὶ αὐτὸν οἱ ἐχθροὶ ἐς δίκην ὑπάγουσι. διὰ τοῦτο λέγει προσειόντες Γοργόνα.

καὶ τοῦτο δήπου τὸ τοῦ Αἰσχύλου,

τοῖς ἑαυτοῦ πτεροῖς περιπεσών,

καὶ ἐνσχεθεὶς ταῖς πάγαις ἃς ἄλλοις ὑφῆκε, τὰ ἐκ τοῦ νόμου δικαίως ἔπαθε· τεύχων ὡς ἑτέρῳ τις ἑῷ κακὸν ἥπατι τεύχει. οὕτως ἄρα αἱ ἰσχυραὶ τιμωρίαι πολλάκις ἐς τοὺς εὑρόντας αὐτὰς περιτρέπονται καὶ ὅσα προσέταξαν παθεῖν ἕτερον, αὐτοὶ πεπόνθασι.

12T10 Ath. 11.85, 494B

ταῦτα καὶ ὁ θαυμάσιος λυτικὸς Σωσίβιος, ὃν οὐκ ἀχαρίτως διέπαιξε διὰ τὰς πολυθρυλητοὺς ταύτας καὶ [τὰς] τοιαύτας λύσεις Πτολεμαῖος ὁ Φιλάδελφος βασιλεύς. λαμβάνοντος γὰρ αὐτοῦ σύνταξιν βασιλικήν, μεταπεμψάμενος τοὺς ταμίας ἐκέλευσεν, ἐὰν παραγένηται ὁ Σωσίβιος ἐπὶ τὴν ἀπαίτησιν τῆς συντάξεως, λέγειν αὐτῷ ὅτι ἀπείληφε. καὶ μετ' οὐ πολὺ παραγενομένῳ καὶ αἰτοῦντι εἰπόντες δεδωκέναι αὐτῷ τὰς ἡσυχίας εἶχον, ὁ δὲ τῷ βασιλεῖ προσελθὼν κατεμέμφετο τοὺς ταμίας. Πτολεμαῖος ⟨δὲ⟩ μεταπεμψάμενος αὐτοὺς καὶ ἥκειν κελεύσας μετὰ τῶν βιβλίων ἐν οἷς αἱ ἀναγραφαί εἰσι τῶν τὰς συντάξεις λαμβανόντων, λαβὼν ταύτας εἰς χεῖρας [ὁ βασιλεὺς] καὶ κατιδὼν ἔφη καὶ αὐτὸς ἀπειληφέναι αὐτὸν οὕτως· ἦν ὀνόματα ἐγγεγραμμένα ταῦτα, Σωτῆρος Σωσιγένους Βίωνος Ἀπολλωνίου [Δίωνος]· εἰς ἃ ἀποβλέψας ὁ βασιλεὺς εἶπεν "ὦ θαυμάσιε λυτικέ, ἐὰν ἀφέλῃς τοῦ Σωτῆρος τὸ σω καὶ τοῦ Σωσιγένους τὸ σι καὶ τοῦ Βίωνος τὴν πρώτην συλλαβὴν [βι] καὶ τὴν τελευταίαν τοῦ Ἀπολλωνίου, εὑρήσεις σαυτὸν ἀπειληφότα κατὰ τὰς σὰς ἐπινοίας. καὶ

"ταῦτ' οὐχ ὑπ'

ἄλλων, ἀλλὰ τοῖς αὑτοῦ πτεροῖς"

κατὰ τὸν θαυμάσιον Αἰσχύλον ἁλίσκῃ, ἀπροσδιονύσους λύσεις πραγματευόμενος."

12T11a Σ *in* Ar. *Av.* 807a

ταυτὶ μὲν RVE εἰκάσμεθα RVEΓM κατὰ τὸν Αἰσχύλον M· ἐκεῖνος γὰρ λιβυστικὴν αὐτὴν καλεῖ παροιμίαν·

[sequitur A. 12F1]. RVEΓM

12T11b ib. 807b

πεποίηκε γὰρ ὁ Αἰσχύλος

αἰετὸν τρωννύμενον καὶ λέγοντα ταῦτα, RVEΓM ἐπειδὴ εἶδε τὸ βέλος ἐπτερωμένον καὶ ἐμπεπαρμένον αὐτῷ. RVEΓ

καὶ ἡμεῖς οὖν, φησίν, RVEΓM οὐχ ὑπ' ἄλλων πάσχομεν ταῦτα, ἀλλὰ τῇ ἑαυτῶν γνώμῃ. RVEΓMLh

12T11c ib. 807c

ᾐκάσμεθα] διεσκώμμεθα. VEΓ³MLh

12T11d ib. 808a

ἀλλὰ Γ τοῖς αὐτῶν πτεροῖς VEΓ· ὅλον τοῦτο ἐκ Μυρμιδόνων Αἰσχύλου. τὸ δὲ

[sequitur A. 12F1.4-5 ⟨τάδ'⟩]

ἀντὶ τοῦ "ἑαυτοῖς ταῦτα πεποιήκαμεν". VEΓ

12T12 Thdr. Stud. *Ep.* 2.162

"Πάντες, φησίν, ὑπερβάθμιον ἐκτείνουσι πόδα, καὶ τῶν οὐ παρακεχωρημένων κατατολμῶσι, καὶ τοῖς ὑψηλοτέροις ἐπεκτείνονται."

Τοῖς οἰκείοις ἑάλως πτεροῖς,

ὥς πού τις ἔφη τῶν ἔξω· ἀφ' οὗ καὶ ἡ πρότασίς σου. Ποὺς γὰρ τεταγμένος, εἰς κεφαλὴν ἐξ αὐθαδείας ἤρθης. Ταῖς ἄλλαις δυσὶ προτάσεσι περιταρείς, ὦ γενναῖε, ἑτέρα πάλιν ἔγκλησις·...

12T13a *Suda*, ει 64 Adler

[vide Ar. 17T31b]

12T13b ib. ο 992

[sequitur A. 12F1.4 οὐχ'-5 (ἁλισκόμεθα)]

ἀντὶ τοῦ ἑαυτοῖς ταῦτα πεποήκαμεν, λόγος γάρ,

[sequitur A. 12F1.2-5 (2 πληγέντα), 3 *add.* τὴν, τοῦ, 4 *om.* τάδ', 5 ἁλισκόμεθα]

12T13c ib. π 3

Πάγας· δίκτυα, παγίδας. καὶ τοῦτο δήπου τὸ τοῦ Αἰσχύλου,

τοῖς ἑαυτοῦ πτεροῖς περιπεσὼν

καὶ ἐνσχεθεὶς ταῖς πάγαις ἃς ἄλλοις ὑφῆκε, τὰ ἐκ τοῦ νόμου δικαίως ἔπαθε. τεύχων ὡς ἑτέρῳ τις, ἑῷ κακὸν ἥπατι τεύχει.

12T13d ib. τ 183

Ταυτὶ μὲν εἰκάσμεθα κατὰ τὸν Αἰσχύλον, τὰ δ' οὐχ ὑπ' ἄλλων, ἀλλὰ τοῖς αὐτῶν πτεροῖς [Ar. 17A4 (807 εἰκάσμεθα)]· ὁ γὰρ Αἰσχύλος Λιβυστικὴν αὐτὴν καλεῖ παροιμίαν.

[sequitur A. 12F1 (1 ὁ δέ, λόγος, 2 πληγέντα, 5 ἁλισκόμεθα)]

τοῖς αὐτῶν πτεροῖς, ἀντὶ τοῦ ἑαυτοῖς ταῦτα πεποιήκαμεν.

12T14a *Suda*, ο 986 Adler

[vide Ar. 17T33a]

12T14b ib. σ 713

[vide Ar. 17T33b]

12T15 Eust. *Il.* Z 168-170

Ὅτι ἐν τῷ "πέμπε δέ μιν", ὡς ἐρρέθη, "Λυκίηνδε", ὁ Προῖτος δηλαδὴ τὸν Βελλεροφόντην, γράμματα καθ' ἑαυτοῦ κομίζοντα, καὶ

ταῦτα οὐχ ὑπ' ἄλλων, ἀλλὰ τοῖς αὐτοῦ, τραγῳδικῶς εἰπεῖν, ἁλισκόμενον πτεροῖς,

"πόρεν δ' ὅ γε σήματα λυγρὰ γράψας ἐν πίνακι πτυκτῷ θυμοφθόρα πολλά. δεῖξαι δ' ἠνώγει ᾧ πενθερῷ, ὄφρ' ἀπόλοιτο", καὶ ἑξῆς...

12T16a Tricl. *in A.* 717a

ση(μείωσαι).

12T16b ibid. b

στροφὴ ἑτέρα κώλων ι'.

12T16c ibid. c

ἔθρεψεν] ἤγουν ἀνέθρεψεν αὐτὸν ἀνήρ τις ἐκτεθέντα.

12T16d ibid. d

λέοντα] τὸν Ἀλέξανδρον λέγει.

12T16e ib. 718a

σίνιν] βλαπτικόν, φθορέα.

12T16f ibid. b

ἀγάλακτον] μήπω κεκορεσμένον γάλακτος· βρέφος γὰρ ἐξετέθη.

12T16g ib. 719

φιλόμαστον] ποθοῦντα μαστόν.

12T16h ib. 716

βιότου προτελείοις] ἐν ταῖς ἀρχαῖς τῆς ζωῆς αὐτοῦ.

12T16i ib. 721a

ἅμερον] πρᾶον, ταπεινόν.

12T16j ibid. b

εὐφιλόπαιδα] τοὺς τῶν ἄλλων παῖδας καλῶς φιλοῦντα.

12T16k ib. 722a

γεραροῖς] τοῖς γέρουσι.

12T16l ibid. b
ἐπίχαρτον] εὐφροσύνης πρόξενον.

12T16m ib. 723a
προσῆλθε δὲ ταῖς ἀγκάλαις τῶν ἀνθρώπων πολλάκις καὶ πρὸς τὴν χεῖρα φαιδρωπὸς δίκην καὶ τρόπον τέκνου νεοτρόφου καὶ νεαροῦ καὶ σαίνων ἐν ταῖς ἀνάγκαις τῆς γαστρός, τουτέστιν ἐκμειλίσσων οἷον καὶ ἐφελκόμενος αὐτοὺς δοῦναι αὐτῷ τροφήν, οἷα τὰ βρέφη ποιεῖν εἰώθασι προσερχόμενα τοῖς γονεῦσι καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις οἷς ἐντυγχάνουσιν. οὕτω τὸ σαίνων πρὸς τὸ ἔσχε καὶ πρὸς τὸ φαιδρωπὸς ἀποδώσεις, καὶ οὐχ ὥς τινες πρὸς τὸ τέκνου ἀποδιδόντες σαίνοντος φασί· ὡς τὸ παρ' Ὁμήρῳ ἀστράπτων ἐπιδέξια [Il. B 353].

12T16n ibid. b
πολέα] ἤγουν πολλάκις.

12T16o ibid. c
ἔσχ'] προσέσχε, προσῆλθε.

12T16p ib. 724a
νεοτρόφου] ἀρτιτρεφοῦς.

12T16q ibid. b
δίκαν] τρόπον.

12T16r ib. 725a
φαιδρωπὸς] χαρωπός.

12T16s ibid. b
ποτὶ] πρός.

12T16t ibid. c
σαίνων] καὶ οἷον ἐφελκόμενος.

12T16u ib. 726a
ἀνάγκαις] ἐν.

12T16v ibid. b
ἀνάγκαις] ἤγουν χρείαν ἔχων τροφῆς.

12T16w ib. 727a
ἀντιστροφὴ κώλων ι'.

12T16x ibid. b
χρονισθεὶς] ἤγουν πλείστους διηνυκὼς χρόνους.

12T16y ibid. c
ἀπέδειξεν] ἔδειξεν.

12T16z ib. 728a
ἔθος] τὸν νόμον.

12T16aa ibid. b
τὸ πρὸς τοκέων] τῶν παρὰ τῶν παίδων εἰς τοὺς τεκόντας.

12T16bb ibid. c
χάριν γὰρ] ἤγουν ἀμοιβὰς διδοὺς τοῖς θρέψασιν αὐτόν.

12T16cc ib. 729a
βουλόμενος ἀμοιβὰς τοῖς τροφεῦσιν ἀποδοῦναι οὐκ ἀγαθὰς αὐτοῖς ἀπέδωκεν, ἀλλὰ πολέμους καὶ μάχας κατασκευάσας τά τε θρέμματα αὐτῶν καὶ τὴν ἄλλην πᾶσαν διώλεσεν ὕπαρξιν καὶ αὐτοὺς τῷ θανάτῳ παρέδωκεν, ἀντ' εὐωχίας καὶ εὐφροσύνης λύπας καὶ στεναγμοὺς καὶ φθορὰν αὐτοῖς ἀποδεδωκώς.

12T16dd ibid. b
ἀμείβων] ἀποδιδούς.

12T16ee ib. 730a
μηλοφόνοισιν] ἤγουν φθοροποιοῖς τῶν θρεμμάτων ἀπὸ μέρους.

12T16ff ibid. b
ἄταισιν] ἐν.

12T16gg ibid. c
ἄταισιν] ἤγουν πολέμοις.

12T16hh ib. 731a
δαῖτ'] εὐωχίαν.

12T16ii ibid. b
ἀκέλευστος] μὴ ὑπ' ἐκείνων εἰς τοῦτο προτραπείς.

12T16jj ibid. c
ἔτευξεν] κατεσκεύασεν αὐτοῖς.

12T16kk ib. 732a
αἵματι] φονευθέντων τῶν ἐν αὐτῷ οἰκούντων.

12T16ll ibid. b
ἐφύρθη] ἐμίχθη.

12T16mm ib. 733a
ἡμέτερα οἰκέτας λέγει ἢ τοὺς τῶν θρεψαμένων αὐτὸν δούλους ἢ καὶ αὐτοὺς ἐκείνους τοὺς θρεψαμένους· οἱ γὰρ πρότερον τροφεῖς τε καὶ πατέρες εἶναι τούτου δοκοῦντες, ὕστερον ἀνακαλεσαμένων τοῦτον τῶν γονέων εἰς τὰ βασίλεια, οἰκέται κἀκεῖνοι εὑρέθησαν. ἱερέα δὲ ἄτης τὸν Ἀλέξανδρον λέγει, ἐπειδὴ οἱ μὲν τὰς θυσιάς ποιοῦντες τῶν θεῶν ἱερεῖς οὐκ ἄτης εἰσὶν ἱερεῖς, ἀλλ' εὐθυμίας μᾶλλον καὶ ὠφελείας τοῖς τὰς θυσίας προσάγουσιν, οὗτος δὲ τῶν τε θρεμμάτων καὶ τῶν ἀνθρώπων σφαγὰς ἐργασάμενος εἰκότως ἄτης ὠνόμασται ἱερεύς.

12T16nn ibid. b
ἄλγος] λύπη, συμφορά.

12T16oo ibid. c
οἰκέταις] τοῖς.

12T16pp ibid. d
οἰκέταις] τῶν θρεψαμένων.

12T16qq ib. 734a
σίνος] βλάβος.

12T16rr ibid. b
πολυκτόνον] πολλοὺς κτεῖναν.

12T16ss ib. 735a
ἱερεύς] σφαγεύς, ὄλεθρος.

12T16tt ibid. b
ἄτας] ἀπωλείας.

12T16uu ib. 736
προσετράφη] ηὐξήθη.

12T17a id. *in* Ar. *Av.* 807b
[vide A. 12T11b (Σ)]

12T17b ib. 807c
[vide A. 12T11c (Σ)]

12T17c ib. 808b
ὅλον τοῦτο ἐκ Μυρμιδόνων Αἰσχύλου. πεποίηκε γὰρ οὗτος ἐκεῖ ἀετὸν βέλος ἰδόντα φερόμενον ἐπ' αὐτὸν εἰπεῖν
[sequitur A. 12F1.4-5 (αὐτῶν)]
καλεῖ δὲ ταύτην λιβυστικὴν ἐκεῖ παροιμίαν. Lh

12T18 Macar. 6.71
[vide Ar. 17T52]

12T19 Arsen. 48.41 (Apostol. 15.88a)
[laudatur A. 12F1.4-5]

12T20 Erasm. *Adag.* 2.3.77 (p. 514)
[vide Ar. 17T62]

12F1 A. *Μυρμιδόνες*, fr. 139 Radt
ὧδ' ἐστὶ μύθων τῶν Λιβυστικῶν κλέος,
πληγέντ' ἀτράκτῳ τοξικῷ τὸν αἰετὸν
εἰπεῖν ἰδόντα μηχανὴν πτερώματος·
"τάδ' οὐχ ὑπ' ἄλλων, ἀλλὰ τοῖς αὐτῶν πτεροῖς
ἁλισκόμεσθα"

12F2 A. *A.* 717-736
ΧΟΡΟΣ
τίς ποτ' ὠνόμαζεν ὧδ' εἰς τὸ πᾶν ἐτητύμως -
μή τις ὅντιν' οὐχ ὁρῶ-
μεν, προνοίαισ(ι) τοῦ πεπρωμένου
γλῶσσαν ἐν τύχᾳ νέμων -
τὰν δορίγαμβρον ἀμφινεικῆ θ'
Ἑλέναν; ἐπεὶ πρεπόντως
ἑλέναυς ἕλανδρος ἑλέπτολις ἐκ τῶν ἁβροπήνων
προκαλυμμάτων ἔπλευσε
Ζεφύρου γίγαντος αὔρᾳ,
πολύανδροί τε φεράσπιδες κυναγοὶ
κατ' ἴχνος πλατᾶν ἄφαντον,
κελσάντων Σιμόεντος ἀκτὰς ἐπ' ἀεξιφύλλους
δι' Ἔριν αἱματόεσσαν.

Ἰλίῳ δὲ κῆδος ὀρθώνυμον τελεσσίφρων
Μῆνις ἤλασεν, τραπέ-

ζας ἀτίμωσιν ὑστέρῳ χρόνῳ
καὶ ξυνεστίου Διός
πρασσομένα τὸ νυμφότιμον
μέλος ἐκφάτως τίοντας,
ὑμέναιον ὃς τότ' ἐπέρρεπε γαμβροῖσιν ἀείδειν.
μεταμανθάνουσα δ' ὕμνον
Πριάμου πόλις γεραιά
πολύθρηνον μέγα που στένει, κικλήσκου-
σα Πάριν τὸν αἰνόλεκτρον,
παμπορθῆ πολύθρηνον αἰῶ θεμένα πολιτᾶν,
μέλεον αἷμ' ἀνατλᾶσα.

ἔθρεψεν δὲ λέοντος ἶ-
νιν δόμοις ἀγάλακτον οὕ-
τως ἀνὴρ φιλόμαστον,
ἐν βιότου προτελείοις
ἅμερον, εὐφιλόπαιδα,
καὶ γεραροῖς ἐπίχαρτον·
πολέα δ' ἔσχ' ἐν ἀγκάλαις
νεοτρόφου τέκνου δίκαν,
φαιδρωπὸς ποτὶ χεῖρα σαί-
νων τε γαστρὸς ἀνάγκαις·

χρονισθεὶς δ' ἀπέδειξεν ἦ-
θος τὸ πρὸς τοκέων· χάριν
γὰρ τροφεῦσιν ἀμείβων
μηλοφόνοισι ⟨σὺ⟩ν ἄταις
δαῖτ' ἀκέλευστος ἔτευξεν,
αἵματι δ' οἶκος ἐφύρθη,
ἄμαχον ἄλγος οἰκέταις,
μέγα σίνος πολύκτονον·
ἐκ θεοῦ δ' ἱερεύς τις Ἄ-
τας δόμοις προσεθρέφθη.

πάραυτα δ' ἐλθεῖν ἐς Ἰλίου πόλιν λέγοιμ' ἂν
φρόνημα μὲν νηνέμου γαλάνας,
ἀκασκαῖον ⟨δ'⟩ ἄγαλμα πλούτου,
μαλθακὸν ὀμμάτων βέλος,
δηξίθυμον ἔρωτος ἄνθος·
παρακλίνασ' ἐπέκρανεν
δὲ γάμου πικρὰς τελευτάς,
δύσεδρος καὶ δυσόμιλος
συμένα Πριαμίδαισιν

πομπᾷ Διὸς ξενίου
νυμφόκλαυτος Ἐρινύς.

παλαίφατος δ' ἐν βροτοῖς γέρων λόγος τέτυκται,
μέγαν τελεσθέντα φωτὸς ὄλβον
τεκνοῦσθαι μηδ' ἄπαιδα θνᾴσκειν,
ἐκ δ' ἀγαθᾶς τύχας γένει
βλαστάνειν ἀκόρεστον οἰζύν.
δίχα δ' ἄλλων μονόφρων εἰ-
μί· τὸ δυσσεβὲς γὰρ ἔργον
μετὰ μὲν πλείονα τίκτει,
σφετέρᾳ δ' εἰκότα γέννᾳ·
οἴκων γὰρ εὐθυδίκων
καλλίπαις πότμος αἰεί.

φιλεῖ δὲ τίκτειν ὕβρις μὲν παλαιὰ νεά-
ζουσαν ἐν κακοῖς βροτῶν
ὕβριν τότ' ἢ τόθ', ὅτε τὸ κύριον μόλῃ
φάος, κότον νεώρη,
δαίμονά τε τὰν ἄμαχον ἀπόλεμον,
ἀνίερον θράσος μελαί-
νας μελάθροισιν Ἄτας,
εἰδομέναν τοκεῦσιν.

Δίκα δὲ λάμπει μὲν ἐν δυσκάπνοις δώμασιν,
τὸν δ' ἐναίσιμον τίει
βίον· τὰ χρυσόπαστα δ' ἔδεθλα σὺν πίνῳ
χερῶν παλιντρόποισ⟨ιν⟩
ὄμμασι λιποῦσ' ὅσια προσέμολε,
δύναμιν οὐ σέβουσα πλού-
του παράσημον αἴνῳ·
πᾶν δ' ἐπὶ τέρμα νωμᾷ.

13. *Sophocles*

13T1 Syn. *Ep.* 5.80

Μεθῆκεν οὖν ἐκ τῶν χειρῶν ὁ κυβερνήτης τὸ πηδάλιον, ἐπειδὴ τὸν ἥλιον εἴκασεν ἀπολελοιπέναι τὴν γῆν, καὶ καταβαλὼν ἑαυτὸν

[sequitur S. 13F1.1146]

Ἡμεῖς δὲ τὴν μὲν οὖσαν αἰτίαν οὐκ εὐθὺς ἐπὶ νοῦν ἐβαλόμεθα, ἀπόγνωσιν δὲ τὸ πρᾶγμα οἰόμενοι, προσῄειμεν, ἐλιπαροῦμεν μὴ καταπροέσθαι μηδέπω τὰς ἐλπίδας· καὶ γὰρ δὴ καὶ ἐπεῖχον αἱ τρικυμίαι, τοῦ πελάγους καὶ πρὸς ἑαυτὸ στασιάσαντος.

13T2a Σ *in Aj.* 1150
ἐγὼ δὲ γ' ἄνδρα ὄπωπα· καὶ οὗτος αἰνίττεται, ὡς ἐφ' ἑτέρου τὸν λόγον ποιούμενος. ΛΦΟΩ$^{\mu}$, ΦΝ$^{\sigma\lambda}$

13T2b ib. 1151
⟨τῶν πέλας·⟩ γρ. τὸ τῶν μέγα εἰ βούλει. Γ$^{\sigma\lambda}$

13T2c ib. 1153a
⟨ὀργήν θ' ὅμοιος·⟩ ὅμοιος τὸν τρόπον ἐμοί. Γ$^{\sigma\lambda}$

13T2d ibid. b
⟨ὀργήν·⟩ τὸν τρόπον. ΛΦΟΗ$^{\sigma\lambda}$

13T2e ib. 1156a
ἄνολβον ἄνδρ'· τὸν ἀσύνετον, τὸν μὴ φρονήσεως εὔπορον. ΜΡ$^{\mu}$

13T2f ibid. b
ἀσύνετον. Ο$^{\sigma\lambda}$

13F1 S. *Aj.* 1142-1146
ΜΕΝΕΛΑΟΣ

Ἤδη ποτ' εἶδον ἄνδρ' ἐγὼ γλώσσῃ θρασὺν
ναύτας ἐφορμήσαντα χειμῶνος τὸ πλεῖν,
ᾧ φθέγμ' ἂν οὐκ ἀνηῦρες, ἡνίκ' ἐν κακῷ
χειμῶνος εἴχετ', ἀλλ' ὑφ' εἵματος κρυφεὶς
πατεῖν παρεῖχε τῷ θέλοντι ναυτίλων.
Οὕτω δὲ καὶ σὲ καὶ τὸ σὸν λάβρον στόμα
σμικροῦ νέφους τάχ' ἄν τις ἐκπνεύσας μέγας
χειμὼν κατασβέσειε τὴν πολλὴν βοήν.
[sequitur S. 13F2]

13F2 S. *Aj.* 1150-1156
[praecedit S. 13F1]
ΤΕΥΚΡΟΣ

Ἐγὼ δέ γ' ἄνδρ' ὄπωπα μωρίας πλέων,
ὃς ἐν κακοῖς ὕβριζε τοῖσι τῶν πέλας.
Κᾆτ' αὐτὸν εἰσιδών τις ἐμφερὴς ἐμοὶ
ὀργήν θ' ὅμοιος εἶπε τοιοῦτον λόγον·
"Ὤνθρωπε, μὴ δρᾶ τοὺς τεθνηκότας κακῶς·
εἰ γὰρ ποιήσεις, ἴσθι πημανούμενος."
Τοιαῦτ' ἄνολβον ἄνδρ' ἐνουθέτει παρών.

Ὁρῶ δέ τοί νιν, κἄστιν, ὡς ἐμοὶ δοκεῖ,
οὐδείς ποτ' ἄλλος ἢ σύ. Μῶν ᾐνιξάμην;
ΜΕΝΕΛΑΟΣ
Ἄπειμι· καὶ γὰρ αἰσχρόν, εἰ πύθοιτό τις,
λόγοις κολάζειν ᾧ βιάζεσθαι παρῇ.
ΤΕΥ. Ἄφερπέ νυν· κἀμοὶ γὰρ αἴσχιστον κλύειν
ἀνδρὸς ματαίου φλαῦρ' ἔπη μυθουμένου.

14. *Sophocles*

14T1 Ael. *NA* 6.51
[vide Ibyc. 8T2]

14T2 Σ *in* Nic. *Ther.* 343-354
[praecedunt Nic. 3T1ab]
ἔστι δὲ ὁ μῦθος παρὰ Σοφοκλεῖ ἐν Κωφοῖς.
[pergit Nic. 3T1b]

14F1 S. *Κωφοί*, fr. 362 Radt
[vide S. 14T1-2]

15. *Achaeus*

15T1 Menedemus Eretr. *ap.* D.L. 2.17 (133)
μάλιστα δὲ πάντων Ὁμήρῳ προσεῖχεν· εἶτα καὶ τοῖς μελικοῖς· ἔπειτα Σοφοκλεῖ, καὶ δὴ καὶ Ἀχαιῷ, ᾧπερ καὶ τὸ δευτερεῖον ἐν τοῖς Σατύροις, Αἰσχύλῳ δὲ τὸ πρωτεῖον ἀπεδίδου. ὅθεν καὶ πρὸς τοὺς ἀντιπολιτευομένους ταῦτα, φασί, προεφέρετο [sc. ὁ Μενέδημος]·
[sequitur Achae. 15A1]
134 ταῦτα δ' ἐστὶν Ἀχαιοῦ ἐκ τῆς σατυρικῆς Ὀμφάλης· ὥστε πταίουσιν οἱ λέγοντες μηδὲν αὐτὸν ἀνεγνωκέναι πλὴν τῆς Μηδείας τῆς Εὐριπίδου, ἣν ἔνιοι Νεόφρονος εἶναι τοῦ Σικυωνίου φασί.

15T2 D.L. 2.17 (133)
[vide Achae. 15T1]

15T3 Erasm. *Adag.* 1.7.68
Aquilam testudo vincit.
Ab hoc non discrepat illud, quod refert Diogenes Laertius in vita Menedemi Philosophi, ex Achaei Poetæ Satyra, cui Titulus Omphale:
[sequitur Achae. 15A1 (ἄραγε, ἀετὸς)]

i.e. Capta est profecto celer ab imbecillibus,
et aquila tempore in brevi a testudine.

Hos senarios ait usurpare solitum Menedemum in eos, qui secum in civilibus honoribus contenderent. Accipi potest per ironiam aut simpliciter, ubi quis potentiorem arte vincit, & quod viribus non potest, assiduitate conficit.

15A1 Achae. *Ὀμφάλη*, *TragGrF* I(Snell)20F34

[praecedit Achae. 15T1]

ἡλίσκετ' ἆρα καὶ πρὸς ἀσθενῶν ταχὺς
καὶ πρὸς χελώνης αἰετὸς βραχεῖ χρόνῳ

[pergit testimonium]

16. *Dinolochus*

16T1 Ael. *NA* 6.51

[vide Ibyc. 8T2]

16F1 Dinol. fr. 8 Kaibel

[= 16T1]

17. *Aristophanes*

17T1 [A.], *AP* 10.110

[laudatur Ar. 17A6 (1431ab-1432)]

17T2 Cic. *Att.* 5.10.3

Reliqua sunt eius modi, ut meum consilium saepe reprehendam, quod non aliqua ratione ex hoc negotio emerserim. O rem minime aptam meis moribus! o illud verum

[sequitur Ar. 17A3.1431: ἔρδοι τις]!

Dices: "Quid adhuc? nondum enim in negotio versaris." Sane scio et puto molestiora restare.

17T3 Cic. *Tusc.* 1.41

sed hic quidem, quamvis eruditus sit, sicut est, haec magistro concedat Aristoteli, canere ipse doceat; bene enim illo Graecorum proverbio praecipitur 'quam quisque norit artem, in hac se exerceat' [~ Ar. 17F3.1431].

17T4 Val. Max. 7.2.ext.7

Aristophanis quoque altioris est prudentiae praeceptum, qui in comoedia introduxit remissum ab inferis † Atheniensium Periclen [Kempf in app. crit.: "*mihi Pericles Valerii potius quam librarii errore intrusus uid.*"] *uaticinantem*

non oportere in urbe nutriri leonem, sin autem sit altus, obsequi ei conuenire [cf. Ar. 17A6]:

monet enim ut praecipuae nobilitatis et concitati ingenii iuuenes refrenentur, nimio uero fauore ac profusa indulgentia pasti quo minus potentiam obtineant ne inpediantur, quod stultum et inutile sit eas obtrectare uires, quas ipse foueris.

17T5 Plu. *Alc.* 16.3

16.1 Ἐν δὲ τοῖς τοιούτοις πολιτεύμασι καὶ λόγοις καὶ φρονήματι καὶ δεινότητι πολλὴν αὖ πάλιν τὴν τρυφὴν τῆς διαίτης καὶ περὶ πότους καὶ ἔρωτας ὑβρίσματα, καὶ θηλύτητας ἐσθήτων ἁλουργῶν ἑλκομένων δι' ἀγορᾶς, καὶ πολυτέλειαν ὑπερήφανον, ἐκτομάς τε καταστρωμάτων ἐν ταῖς τριήρεσιν, ὅπως μαλακώτερον ἐγκαθεύδοι, κειρίαις, ἀλλὰ μὴ σανίσι, τῶν στρωμάτων ἐπιβαλλομένων, ἀσπίδος τε διαχρύσου ποίησιν οὐδὲν ἐπίσημον τῶν πατρίων ἔχουσαν, 2 ἀλλ' Ἔρωτα κεραυνοφόρον [ἅπερ] ὁρῶντες, οἱ μὲν ἔνδοξοι μετὰ τοῦ βδελύττεσθαι καὶ δυσχεραίνειν ἐφοβοῦντο τὴν ὀλιγωρίαν αὐτοῦ καὶ παρανομίαν ὡς τυραννικὰ καὶ ἀλλόκοτα, τοῦ δὲ δήμου τὸ πάθος τὸ πρὸς αὐτὸν οὐ κακῶς ἐξηγούμενος ὁ Ἀριστοφάνης ταῦτ' εἴρηκε· Ποθεῖ μέν, ἐχθαίρει δέ, βούλεται δ' ἔχειν [Ar. *Ra.* 1425] ἔτι δὲ μᾶλλον τῇ ὑπονοίᾳ πιέζων·

[sequitur Ar. 17A6, 1431-1432]

17T6 Σ *in* Ar. *Av.* 440 (Symm.)

ἥνπερ ὁ πίθηκος τῇ γυναικὶ διέθετο· (Σύμμαχος· Αἰσωπείου λόγου ἢ τοιούτου τινὸς ἔοικε μεμνῆσθαι. Καλλίστρατος δὲ τοσοῦτόν φησιν, ἐκ διηγηματίου τινὸς εἱλκύσθαι. καὶ Δίδυμος,) ὅτι αἰσχρός τις ἦν τὴν ὄψιν συνεχῶς τῇ γυναικὶ διαπληκτιζόμενος, συνέθετο ἐπὶ φίλων μήτε τύπτειν μήτε τύπτεσθαι μήτε δάκνειν αὐτὸν φιλοῦντα, μήτε δάκνεσθαι. οἷον, σὺ μὲν οὐχ ἑλκύσεις τῶν ὀρχιπέδων, οὐδὲ ἐγὼ τῶν τριχῶν. ἔοικε δὲ Παναίτιον κωμῳδεῖν, (ὃν καὶ ἐν Νήσοις "καταλιπὼν Παναίτιον πίθηκον." ἔνθα καὶ μαγείρου πατρὸς αὐτὸν λέγει). πίθηκον δὲ αὐτὸν εἶπε διὰ τὸ πανοῦργον.

17T7 Zen. 1.20

Ἀετὸν κάνθαρος μαιεύεται [~ Ar. 17A5]·

παροιμία· τὰ γὰρ ᾠὰ τοῦ ἀετοῦ ἀφανίζουσιν οἱ κάνθαροι κυλίοντες, ἐπεὶ οἱ ἀετοὶ τοὺς κανθάρους ἀναλέγουσιν.

17T8 Ps.-Diogenian. *Praef.* (p. 179 Leutsch-Schneidewin)

[praecedit Ps.-Diogenian. G28]

...Ἀριστοφάνης ἐν Σφηξίν, ὡς

ἀνδρὶ Συβαρίτῃ ἀπείρῳ ἱππικῆς ἐφ' ἅρμα ἀναβάντι συνέβη κατενεχθέντι συντριβῆναι, φίλον δ' αὐτῷ παρόντα φάναι τὸ

[sequitur Ar. 17F3, 1431]

[pergit testimonium]

17T9a Diogenian. V 1.65

Ἀετὸν κάνθαρος μαιεύεται [~ Ar. 17A5]·

τὰ γὰρ ᾠὰ τοῦ ἀετοῦ ἀφανίζουσιν οἱ κάνθαροι, ἐπεὶ οἱ ἀετοὶ τοὺς κανθάρους ἀναλέγουσι. Εἴληπται ἡ παροιμία ἐπὶ τῶν περιπιπτόντων τοῖς παρ' αὐτῶν ἀδικηθεῖσι καὶ κατ' ἀξίαν τιμωρουμένων.

17T9b Diogenian. 2.44

Ἀετὸν κάνθαρος μαιεύεται [~ Ar. 17A5]·

ἐπὶ τῶν κακῶς ὑπό τινων πασχόντων. Τὰ γὰρ ᾠὰ τοῦ ἀετοῦ ἀφανίζει κυλίων ὁ κάνθαρος.

17T10 anon. *Περὶ αἴνου* (p. 154.3-13 Bartoletti)

[praecedit anon. *Περὶ αἴνου* G39]

καὶ]

μετ' ὀλίγον·

[sequitur Ar. 17F4 (ἐχεῖ[νον, τὰν μαρτυρίαν)]

[pergit testimonium]

17T11 Gal. *Simp. med. temp.* 11.37 (12.360-361 Kühn)

Ὅ γε μὴν κόρυδος τὸ πτηνὸν ζῷον τουτὶ τὸ μικρόν, ὃ καὶ κατὰ τὰς ὁδοὺς πολλάκις ὁρῶμεν, ἑψόμενον ἐν τῷ ζωμῷ τοὺς κωλικοὺς ὠφελεῖ. χρὴ δὲ συνεχῶς καὶ πολλάκις ἐσθίειν αὐτὸ μετὰ τοῦ ζωμοῦ. ἔχει δὲ ἐπὶ τῆς κεφαλῆς τοῦτο τὸ ζῷον ὥσπερ τινὰ λόφον ἐκ τῶν τριχῶν αὐτοφυῆ, δι' ὃν καὶ ὁ μῦθος ὃν Ἀριστοφάνης ὁ κωμικὸς ἔγραψεν ἐπλάσθη. λέγει δὲ περὶ αὐτοῦ τόνδε τὸν τρόπον·

[sequitur Ar. 17F6 (471 μεμάθηκας)]

[sequitur Theoc. 21T1]

προσέθηκα δὲ ταῦτα τῷ λόγῳ, διὰ τὸ βούλεσθαι σαφῶς δηλῶσαι τὸ ζῷον τὸν κόρυδον, ὁποίαν τινὰ τὴν ἐπὶ τῆς κεφαλῆς ἀνάστασιν ἔχει τῶν τριχῶν, ἐπειδὴ τῆς ὠφελείας αὐτοῦ πρὸς τοὺς κωλικοὺς ἐπειράθην, καὶ βούλομαι καλῶς γνωρίσαι τοῖς οὐκ εἰδόσιν αὐτό, ἐπειδὴ τοῖς πυργήτοις ὀνομαζομένοις ἔοικεν, ἀλλὰ τῷ τε λόφῳ διακρίνεται καὶ βραχύ τι μείζων ἐστὶν αὐτοῦ. καὶ γάρ τοι καὶ ἡ κορυδαλὶς καλουμένη βοτάνη καὶ αὐτοῖς κωλικοῖς ἁρμόττει. καί σοι καὶ τοῦτο κατὰ τὸ πάρεργον ἐγνώσθω.

17T12 Ael. *NA* 16.5

5 Ἀκούω δὲ ἔγωγε καὶ Ἰνδὸν ἔποπα διπλασίονα τοῦ παρ' ἡμῖν καὶ ὡραιότερον ἰδεῖν. καὶ Ὅμηρος μὲν λέγει βασιλεῖ κεῖσθαι ἄγαλμα Ἕλληνι χαλινὸν καὶ κόσμον ἵππου, ὁ δὲ ἔποψ οὗτος Ἰνδῶν βασιλεῖ ἄθυρμά ἐστι, καὶ διὰ χειρῶν αὐτὸν φέρει, καὶ ἥδεται αὐτῷ, καὶ συνεχὲς ἐνορᾷ τὴν ἀγλαΐαν τεθηπὼς τοῦ ὄρνιθος καὶ τὸ κάλλος τὸ αὐτοφυές. ἐπᾴδουσι δὲ ἄρα τῷδε τῷ ὀρνέῳ καὶ μῦθον Βραχμᾶνες, καὶ ὅ γε μῦθος ὁ ᾀδόμενος οὗτός ἐστιν.

παῖς ἐγένετο Ἰνδῶν βασιλεῖ, καὶ ἀδελφοὺς εἶχεν, οἵπερ οὖν ἀνδρωθέντες ἐκδικώτατοί τε γίνονται καὶ λεωργότατοι. καὶ τούτου μὲν ὡς

νεωτάτου καταφρονοῦσι, τὸν δὲ πατέρα ἐκερτόμουν καὶ τὴν μητέρα, τὸ γῆρας αὐτῶν ἐκφαυλίσαντες. ἀναίνονται οὖν ἐκεῖνοι τὴν σὺν αὐτοῖς διατριβήν, καὶ ᾤχοντο φεύγοντες ὅ τε παῖς καὶ οἱ γέροντες. συντόνου δὲ ἄρα αὐτοὺς πορείας διαδεξαμένης, οἱ μὲν ἀπεῖπον καὶ ἀποθνήσκουσιν, ὁ δὲ παῖς οὐκ ὠλιγώρησεν αὐτῶν, ἀλλ' ἔθαψεν αὐτοὺς ἐν ἑαυτῷ, ξίφει τὴν κεφαλὴν διατεμών. ἀγασθέντα δὲ τὸν πάντ' ἐφορῶντα Ἥλιον οἱ αὐτοί φασι τῆς εὐσεβείας τὴν ὑπερβολήν, ὄρνιν αὐτὸν ἀποφῆναι, κάλλιστον μὲν ὄψει, μακραίωνα δὲ τὸν βίον· ὑπανέστηκε δέ οἱ καὶ λόφος ἐκ τῆς κορυφῆς, οἱονεὶ μνημεῖον τοῦτο τῶν πεπραγμένων ὅτε ἔφευγεν.

τοιαῦτα ἄττα καὶ Ἀθηναῖοι ὑπὲρ τοῦ κορύδου τερατευόμενοι προσεῖχον μύθῳ τινί, ᾧπερ οὖν ἀκολουθῆσαί μοι δοκεῖ καὶ Ἀριστοφάνης ὁ τῆς κωμῳδίας ποιητὴς ἐν Ὄρνισι λέγων

[sequitur Ar. 17F6].

ἔοικεν οὖν ἐξ Ἰνδῶν τὸ μυθολόγημα ἐπ' ἄλλου μὲν ὄρνιθος, ἐπιρρεῦσαι δ' οὖν καὶ τοῖς Ἕλλησιν. Ὠγύγιον γάρ τι μῆκος χρόνου λέγουσι Βραχμᾶνες, ἐξ οὗ ταῦτα τῷ ἔποπι τῷ Ἰνδῷ ἔτι ἀνθρώπῳ ὄντι καὶ παιδὶ τήν γε ἡλικίαν ἐς τοὺς γειναμένους πέπρακται.

17T13 [Hdn.] *Philet.* 2

Ἡ μεθύση ἐπὶ γυναικὸς λέγεται. Καὶ Ἀριστοφάνης·

[sequitur 17F2.1402]

17T14 Σ *in Ach.* 120

[vide Archil. 4T23]

17T15 Σ *in Av.* 15

ὃς τώδ' ἔφασκε νῷν· (Οἱ μέν φασιν αὐτὸν διασύρειν τὸν Αἰσώπειον λόγον καὶ δέον εἰπεῖν τῶν ἀνθρώπων, λέγειν ἐκ τῶν ὀρνέων,...)

17T16a Σ *in Av.* 471a

γὰρ] ναί. Γ²

17T16b ib. 471b

[vide Σ *in* Ar. G66a]

17T16c ib. 471c

†φαίνονται† τὸ τοιοῦτον ἅπαν Αἰσώπῳ ἀνατιθέντες. VΓLh

17T16d ib. 471d.α

τὸ πατῆσαι ἴσον ἐστὶ τῷ ἐνδιατρῖψαι. VΓM ὡς τὸ ἀφικέσθαι που λέγομεν. VΓ

17T16e ib. 471e

πεπάτηκας Γ· ἀντὶ τοῦ "ἀνέγνως". RVM9ΓΓ²Lh^bis

17T16f ib. 472a
ὃς] ὁ Αἴσωπος. Γ[2]

17T16g ib. 472b
λέγων] διηγούμενος. Γ[2]

17T16h ib. 472c.α
ταῦτα μὲν κωμικώτερον παίζει. VM9Γ τὸν δὲ κορυδὸν ἔνιοι κορυδαλὸν λέγουσιν. γῆς δὲ ἱερὸν ὄρνιν νομίζουσιν εἶναι. VΓM

17T16i ib. 473
ἀποθνήσκειν] ἀντὶ τοῦ "ἀποθανεῖν". Γ[2]

17T16j ib. 475a
ἐπεὶ λόφον ἔχει ἡ κορυδός. Γ[2]

17T16k ib. 475b
θηλυκῶς εἴρηκε τὴν κορυδόν. Πλάτων [*Euthd.* 291b] δὲ ἀρσενικῶς. $VM_9\Gamma^3Lh$

17T16l ib. 475c
κατορύξαι] κατασκάψαι, ἐμβαλεῖν. Γ[2]

17T17a ib. 651b
[vide Archil. 4T25]

17T17b ib. 652
ὡς] ὅτι.

17T17c ib. 653
φλαύρως] ῥᾳδίως.

17T18a ib. 807a
[vide A. 12T11a]

17T18b ib. 807b
[vide A. 12T11b]

17T18c ib. 807c
[vide A. 12T11c]

17T18d ib. 808a
[vide A. 12T11d]

17T19a Σ *in Lys.* 694a

αἰετὸν τίκτοντα Γ: παροιμία, ἧς μέμνηται καὶ ἐν Εἰρήνῃ.

τὰ γὰρ ᾠὰ τῶν ἀετῶν οἱ κάνθαροι κυλίοντες διαφθείρουσιν, ἐπεὶ τοὺς κανθάρους οἱ ἀετοὶ ἀναλέγονται. RΓ

17T19b ibid. 694b

λείπει τὸ "ὡς". R

17T20a Σ *in Pac.* 129α

τοῦ μυθοποιοῦ. φέρεται γὰρ αὐτοῦ μῦθος

ἐχθρεῦσαι ἀετὸν καὶ κάνθαρον ἐκ τοῦ ἑκάτερον αὐτῶν θατέρου τὰ ᾠὰ διασπᾶν. V

17T20b ib. 130α

μόνος πετεινῶν R· ὁ λόγος τοιοῦτός ἐστιν.

ἁρπάζοντος τοῦ ἀετοῦ τοὺς νεοττοὺς τοὺς τοῦ κανθάρου [[καὶ]] ὁ κάνθαρος τὰ ᾠὰ τοῦ ἀετοῦ ἐκκλέψας ἐξεκύλισεν ἕως τοσούτου, ἕως ἦλθε πρὸς τὸν Δία. κατηγοροῦντος δὲ τοῦ ἀετοῦ προσέταξεν ὁ Ζεὺς τῷ ἀετῷ ἐν τῷ αὐτοῦ RV τοῦ Διὸς V κόλπῳ νεοττεύειν. ἐπειδὴ δὲ τὰ ᾠὰ εἶχεν ὁ Ζεύς, περιίπτατο τὸν Δία ὁ κάνθαρος. ὁ δὲ ἐκλαθόμενος ἀνέστη ὡς σοβήσων ἐκ τῆς κεφαλῆς αὐτὸν καὶ κατέαξε τὰ ᾠά. ὁ δὲ λόγος πρὸς ἀδίκους ἐστίν, ὅτι οὐδεμία ἐστὶν αὐτοῖς ἀσφάλεια, οὐδ', ἂν εἰς τὸν κόλπον τοῦ Διὸς καταφύγωσι, διαφεύξονται τὴν τιμωρίαν. RV

17T20c ib. 134b

κἀντιτιμωρούμενος Lh· ὁ κάνθαρος VLh δηλονότι· Lh

πρῶτος γὰρ ὁ ἀετὸς ἠδίκησεν αὐτὸν φαγὼν τὰ νοσσία. VLh

17T21 Σ *in Ra.* 1432

μάλιστα μὲν λέοντα· (Μάλιστα μὲν) μὴ ἀνατρέφειν φρόνημα, ἐὰν δὲ ἀνατρέφῃ, μὴ ἐρεθίζειν, ἀλλὰ τιθασῶσαι. ὥστε ὁ μὲν Εὐριπίδης συμβεβούλευκε μὴ δέχεσθαι, ὁ δὲ Αἰσχύλος τοιαύτην τινὰ διάνοιαν, ἢ μὴ καταδέξασθαι, ἢ καταδεχαμένους τροποφορεῖν. (ἔν τισι δὲ μετὰ τὸ πρῶτον ὁμολογουμένως Αἰσχύλου, τοὺς δὲ ἑξῆς ἄδηλον τίνος. ἢ γὰρ Εὐριπίδης δίς ἐστιν ἀποφηνάμενος, ἢ ὁ Διόνυσος ἀντὶ τοῦ ἀκούειν ἐκείνου αὐτὸς λέγων καὶ ταῦτα, ἐπεξεργαζόμενος τὸ παρ' Αἰσχύλου λεγόμενον· ἢ ὁ χορός. ἔν τισι δὲ ἑνός ἐστι τὰ τρία, τοῦ Αἰσχύλου πρῶτον μὲν ἀποφατικῶς λέγοντος, τὰ δὲ ἑξῆς δύο μαλακώτερον ὑποτιθεμένου.)

17T22 Σ *in V.* 191d

περὶ ὄνου σκιᾶς· παροιμία ἐστὶ(ν) VLhAld τὸ "περὶ ὄνου σκιᾶς" Lh ἴση Lh [· ἴσον Ald] τῷ περὶ μηδενὸς λαμβανομένη Lh [· ἔστι δὲ Ald] LhAld

ἐπὶ τῶν τὰ ἀνόνητα φιλονεικούντων (.) VLhAld, ἣν μετήνεγκε νῦν ὁ πρεσβύτης. VAld ἔστι δὲ ἀπὸ τοιαύτης αἰτίας· φασί

ποτε ἐν Ἀθήναις τινὰ δεηθέντα ὀνηλάτου μισθώσασθαι ὄνον ἐπὶ τῷ τὰ VAld φορτία μόνα VAld* βαστάσαι ἐπὶ τὰ VAld Μέγαρα. VLhAld

καὶ δὴ οὕτω δόξαν αὐτοῖς ἐπιθέντες τὰ φορτία ὥδευον. VAld	κάτω θεὶς οὖν τὸν μισθὸν καὶ ἐπιθεὶς τὰ φορτία ὥδευε μετὰ τοῦ ὀνηλάτου. Lh

μεσημβρίας δὲ γενομένης καὶ τῶν ὑπὸ τὸν Lh κύνα καυμάτων σφοδρῶς αὐτοῖς ἐπικειμένων VLhAld

οὐχ εὑρίσκοντες σκέπην ἡλίου (?) (lac.)· διὸ V καθεῖλε τὰ φορτία ἀπὸ τοῦ ὄνου ὁ δεσπότης αὐτῶν καὶ δι' αὐτῶν αὐτῷ V /ἑαυτῷ Ald/σκιὰν ἐποίησεν· VAld	καὶ μὴ δυνάμενοι μήτε αὐτοὶ ὁδοιπορεῖν μήτε ὁ ὄνος καθεῖλον τὰ φορτία ἀπὸ τοῦ ὄνου. μὴ δυνάμενος δὲ καὶ ἔτι ὁ τὸν ὄνον μισθωσάμενος ὑπομένειν τὸν καύσωνα δραμὼν ἐπὶ τὴν ὄνου σκιὰν ἐκάθισεν· Lh

πρὸς ὃ μαχόμενος ὁ ὀνηλάτης ἔλεγεν ὄνον μεμισθωκέναι VAld [μισθώσασθαι Lh] ἐπὶ τῷ VAld φορτία φέρειν VLh [φορεῖν Ald], οὐ σκιὰν παρέξειν. VLhAld

ὁ δὲ ἔλεγε μεμισθῶσθαι, ὅπως ἂν ⟦ὡς⟧ βούλοιτο χρῆσθαι. VAld	ὁ δὲ ἔλεγεν, ὅ τι βούλοιτο χρήσασθαι, μισθώσασθαι. Lh

ἐκ δὲ ταύτης τῆς VAld [τῆς τοιαύτης οὖν Lh] φιλονεικίας μηδὲν οὔσης εἰς δικαστήριον κατηνέχθησαν·

ὅθεν ἡ παροιμία (.) VLhAld ἐλήφθη, ἐπὶ τῶν μαχομένων περὶ τῶν μηδενὸς ἀξίων. Lh

17T23a ib. 1182a

μῦς καὶ γαλῆ·

[sequitur Σ *in* Ar. G67a]

17T23b ib. 1182b

μῦς καὶ γαλῆ· ἀρχὴ μύθου. RVΓLhAld τοῦτο δὲ πρὸς τὸ κατ' οἰκίαν εἰρημένον τῷ Βδελυκλέωνι οἰόμενος περὶ μυθαρίων αὐτὸν λέγειν. VΓLhAld

17T24a ib. 1403

ὦ κύον κύον· τὴν ἀρτόπωλιν V [ἀρτοπώλιδα LhAld] κύνα εἶπεν. "ὑλακτούσης σου", φησίν, "οὐ φροντίζω(") (.) VLhAld, ὦ κύον".

17T24b ib. 1405
πυροὺς κτλ.] σίτους LhAld ὥστε ἄρτους ποιῆσαι· ἐπεὶ ἀρτόπωλις V [ἀρτοπῶλις LhAld. VLhAld

17T25a ib. 1428
ἀττικὸν τὸ σχῆμα. V

17T25b ib. 1429
οὐ τρίβων· ἀντὶ τοῦ V οὐκ ἔμπειρος. VLhAld καὶ ἐν Νεφέλαις· καὶ τῶν κρεμαθρῶν οὐ τρίβων τῶν ἐνθάδε [Nu. 869].

17T25c ib. 1431a
παροιμιακόν. V

17T25d ib. 1431b
ἔρδοι τις· ἕκαστος, φησίν, LhAld ἣν οἶδε τέχνην ἐργαζέσθω. VLhAld

17T25e ib. 1431c
καὶ ταῦτα ἐν ταῖς RV παροιμίαις φέρεται RLhAld [φέρουσιν V].

17T25f ib. 1432
εἰς τὰ Πιττάλου· εἰς ἰατροῦ, φησίν, ἀπότρεχε LhAld θεραπευθησόμενος τὰς πληγάς· ἰατρὸς γὰρ ὁ Πίτταλος. VLhAld

17T26a ib. 1436a
ἐχῖνον] χύτρας εἶδος (.) RVLh ὁ ἐχῖνος. RV

17T26b ib. 1438a
ναὶ τὰν Κόραν· τὴν Περσεφόνην (.) VLhAld Κόρην ὠνόμασεν· ὀνομάζουσι γὰρ αὐτὴν καὶ οὕτω. Lh δωρίζει δὲ VLhAld ἐπίτηδες. RVLhAld

17T26c ib. 1440a
καὶ τὰ V ἕλκη ἐπέδησας. RV

17T27a Σ *in V.* 1446
Αἴσωπον οἱ Δελφοί· ὁ μὲν Βδελυκλέων ἀράμενος τὸν πατέρα αὐτοῦ Φιλοκλέωνα εἴσω κομίζει. ὁ δὲ LhAld

βασταζόμενος λόγον λέγει. V φασὶ γὰρ τὸν Αἴσωπον RV*It* εἰς †θεοὺς† ἐλθόντα RV	φερόμενος πλάττει μῦθον. Lh (Taur) Ald διηγεῖται γὰρ τὸν περὶ Αἰσώπου λόγον· ὅν φασιν Ald ἐλθόντα ποτὲ εἰς τοὺς Δελφοὺς *It*Ald

ἀποσκῶψαι εἰς τοὺς Δελφοὺς RV [αὐτούς *lt*Ald], ὅτι μὴ ἔχοιεν γῆν, ἀφ' ἧς ἐργαζόμενοι διετρέφοντο RV [διατρέφοιντο *lt*Ald], ἀλλὰ περιμένοιεν ἀπὸ τῶν τοῦ R θεοῦ θυμάτων διαζῶντες R [διαζῆν V*lt*Ald]. RV*lt*Ald

οἱ δὲ V*lt* Δελφοὶ πρὸς τοῦτο σφόδρα λυπηθέντες πρὸς αὐτὴν τὴν ἔξοδον τοῦ Αἰσώπου RV [ἐν τῇ ἐξόδῳ αὐτοῦ *lt*] ὑπέβαλον ποτήριον τῶν RV τοῦ θεοῦ ἐν *lt* τοῖς σκεύεσιν αὐτοῦ· κἀκεῖνος RV [ἐκεῖνος δὲ *lt*] οὐκ εἰδὼς ἐξώρμησεν. οἱ δὲ προσδραμόντες καὶ τὸ ποτήριον εὑρόντες ἐφόνευσαν αὐτόν. RV*lt* ὁ δὲ μεταξὺ φονευόμενος *lt*

οἱ δὲ Δελφοὶ χαλεπήσαντες φιάλην ἱερὰν τοῖς Αἰσώπου σκεύεσιν ὑπέβαλον. ὁ μὲν δὴ οὐκ εἰδὼς τὴν ἐς Φωκίδα φέρουσαν ὥρμησεν ὁδόν. οἱ δ' ἐπιδραμόντες καὶ φωράσαντες ἱεροσυλίας αὐτοῦ κατηγόρουν. ὁ δ' ἐπὶ τὴν πέτραν οὐ πάνυ πόρρω τοῦ ἱεροῦ καὶ τῆς πόλεως ἀγόμενος, ἀφ' ἧς νόμιμον ἦν τοὺς ἱεροσύλους ῥιπτεῖσθαι, Ald

τὸν περὶ τοῦ κανθάρου μῦθον
αὐτοῖς διηγήσατο. μέμνηται τούτου τοῦ μύθου καὶ ἐν Εἰρήνῃ LhTaur.
[οὗ γε καὶ ἐν Εἰρήνῃ μέμνηται Ald] *lt*Ald διὰ τούτων ὁ ποιητής·
[sequitur Ar. 17A2.129-130 (πετεινῶν)]
ἐκεῖ δὲ τὰ εἰκότα λεχθήσεται. Ald

17T27b ib. 1448
ὡς ὁ κάνθαρός ποτε] ὡς
κάνθαρος ἀνῆλθεν (ἐ) ποτε πρὸς Δία Lh,
ὡς καὶ R ἐν Εἰρήνῃ. RLh

17T28a *Suda*, α 1470 Adler
Ἀμάθητος· ἀδίδακτος. ὁ δὲ Ἰουστῖνος ἀμάθητος ἦν γραμμάτων ἁπάντων καὶ τὸ δὴ λεγόμενον ἀναλφάβητος. καί,
[sequitur Ar. 17F6.471, om. γὰρ, add. -ε τὸν].
ἐπὶ τῶν ἰδιωτῶν. τὸ δὲ πατῆσαι ἴσόν ἐστι τῷ ἐνδιατρίψαι· ὡς τὸ ἀφικέσθαι που λέγομεν.

17T28b ib. π 783
Πατῆσαι· ἐνδιατρίψαι, ἀφικέσθαι. Ἀριστοφάνης·
[sequitur Ar. 17F6.471]
ἐπὶ τῶν ἰδιωτῶν.

17T29 *Suda*, αι 335 Adler
Αἴσωπος· ὁ τῶν μύθων ποιητής, Σάμιος, δοῦλος οὐ τὴν τύχην μᾶλλον ἢ τὴν προαίρεσιν, οὐκ ἄφρων μὲν οὐδὲ κατ' αὐτὸ τοῦτο ἀνήρ. ᾧ γὰρ ὁ νόμος οὐ μετεδίδου παρρησίας, τούτῳ προσῆκον ἦν ἐσκιαγραφημένας τὰς συμβουλὰς καὶ πεποικιλμένας ἡδονῇ καὶ χάριτι παραφέρειν, ὥσπερ καὶ τῶν ἰατρῶν οἱ μὲν ἐλεύθεροι τὸ δέον ἐπιτάττουσιν, ἐὰν δέ τις οἰκέτης γένηται τὴν τύχην καὶ τὴν τέχνην ἰατρός, πράγματα ἔχει κολακεύειν ἅμα καὶ θεραπεύειν τὸν δεσπότην ἀναγκαζόμενος. ὅτι
[sequitur Ar. 17F2]

ὅτι τὸν Αἴσωπόν φασί τινες ὡς τοσοῦτον ἄρα θεοφιλῆ γενέσθαι ὡς καὶ ἀναβιῶναι αὐτόν, καθάπερ οὖν τὸν Τυνδάρεων καὶ τὸν Ἡρακλέα καὶ τὸν Γλαῦκον. καὶ Πλάτων φησὶν ὁ κωμικός· καὶ νῦν ὅμοσόν μοι μὴ τεθνάναι τὸ σῶμα. ἐγώ. ψυχὴ δ' ἀπὸ νίκης ὥσπερ Αἰσώπου ποτέ.

17T30 *Suda*, ε 2289 Adler

Ἐπίδεσμος· ὁ ἐπὶ πληγῇ δεσμός. Ἀριστοφάνης·

[sequitur Ar. 17F4, add. 1435 ἄκουε, μὴ φεῦγ', om. 1436 ταῦτ' ἐγὼ μαρτύρομαι; 1440 ἔχῃς]

17T31a *Suda*, ε 2913 Adler

Ἔρδοι· πράττοι, ἐργάζοιτο.

[sequitur Ar. 17F3.1431]

17T31b ib. ει 26

Εἰδεῖεν· γινώσκοιεν. καὶ Εἰδείη, γινώσκοι, ἐπίσταιτο. Ἀριστοφάνης·

[sequitur Ar. 17F3.1431]

17T31c ib. τ 953

Τρίβων· ἔμπειρος. Ἀριστοφάνης·

[sequitur Ar. 17F3.1429]

17T32a *Suda*, ει 64 Adler

Εἰκάσμεθα· παρὰ Ἀριστοφάνει, ἀντὶ τοῦ ἐσκώμμεθα.

[sequitur Ar. 17A4.807]

17T32b ib. τ 183

[vide A. 12T13d]

17T33a *Suda*, ο 986 Adler

Οὐ χρή·

[sequitur Ar. 17A6]

Ἀριστοφάνης. Αἰσχύλος δὲ λέγει περὶ Ἀλκιβιάδου· μὴ ἀνατρέφειν φρόνημα· ἐὰν δὲ ἀνατρέφῃ, μὴ ἐρεθίζειν, ἀλλὰ τιθασεῦσαι. ὥστε ὁ μὲν Εὐριπίδης συμβεβούλευκε μὴ δέχεσθαι, ὁ δὲ Αἰσχύλος τοιαύτην τινὰ διάνοιαν μὴ καταδέξασθαι, ἢ καταδεξάμενον τροποφορεῖν. ὁ δὲ Διόνυσος πρὸς τάδε φησί· δυσκρίτως μέν γ' ἔχω, σοφῶς γὰρ εἶπεν, ὁ δ' ἕτερος σαφῶς [Ra. 1433 δυσκρίτως-1434 (1433 add. μέν γ', 1434 om. ὁ μὲν)]. σοφῶς μὲν ὁ Αἰσχύλος, σαφῶς δὲ ὁ Εὐριπίδης.

17T33b ib. σ 713

Σκύμνος· σκύλαξ λέοντος.

[sequitur Ar. 17A6]

Αἰσχύλος δὲ λέγει περὶ Ἀλκιβιάδου· μὴ ἀνατρέφειν φρόνημα· ἐὰν δὲ ἀνατρέφῃ, μὴ ἐρεθίζειν, ἀλλὰ τιθασσεῦσαι. καὶ ὁ μὲν Εὐριπίδης συμβεβούλευκε μὴ δέξασθαι· ὁ δὲ Αἰσχύλος τοιαύτην τινὰ διάνοιαν, μὴ καταδέξασθαι ἢ καταδεξάμενον τροποφορεῖν. καὶ ὁ μὲν Αἰσχύλος σοφῶς εἶπεν, ὁ δὲ Εὐριπίδης σαφῶς.

17T34 Tz. *in Av.* 475
κατορύξαι] ἀρχῆς τὸ τέλος.

17T35a Tz. *in Av.* 652
τὴν ἀλώπεχ'] ἡ ⟨ἀλώπ⟩ηξ.

17T35b ib. 653
φλαύρως] φιλικῶς, ῥᾳδίως.

17T36 Tz. *in Av.* 808
τάδ'...ἄλλων] ἤγουν ὁ χὴν καὶ ὁ κόψιχος.

17T37a Tz. *in Ra.* 1431
οὐ χρὴ λέοντος· ὁ μὲν Εὐριπίδης μηδόλως εἶπε δέξασθαι τοῦτον· ὁ δὲ Αἰσχύλος φησί· καλὸν μὲν μὴ δέξασθαι τύραννον, ἢ καταδεξαμένους θεραπεύειν.

17T37b ib. 1432
ὑπηρετεῖν] χρή.

17T38 Eust. *Il.* Ω 317-319
Ὁ δὲ μῦθος ἐπὶ τοῦ βασιλικοῦ ἀετοῦ, παιδεύων ὡς ὑφεδρεύει ἀεὶ τοῖς μεγάλοις, εἰ μὴ μεγάλα, μικρὰ γοῦν τινα δυσχερῆ, πλάττει

τὸν ἀετὸν κανθάρῳ μὴ φίλον, ὅς, φησίν, ἀνέρπων εἰς τὰς τοῦ ἀετοῦ καλιὰς ἢ καὶ ἀνιπτάμενος κατὰ τὸν τοῦ Κωμικοῦ ἱπποκάνθαρον ἐλυμαίνετο τοῖς ἐκείνου ᾠοῖς, ὁ δ' ὑπ ἀμηχανίας ἱκετεύσας ἐνεοττεύει τοῖς τοῦ Διὸς κόλποις. καὶ ὁ κάνθαρος κατατολμᾷ καὶ τῶν ἐκεῖ καὶ λαθὼν γίνεται καὶ αὐτὸς τοῦ Διΐου κόλπου. καὶ ὁ Ζεὺς ἰδὼν μυσάττεται καὶ ἀνίσταται ὡς εἶχε, καὶ τὰ ᾠὰ καταπίπτει καὶ ῥήγνυται, τὸ θελητὸν τῷ κανθάρῳ.

ἐκ τούτων δὴ παροιμία τὸ "αἰετὸν κάνθαρος μαιεύσομαι", ἧς τὸ ἀληθές· ἐπεὶ τὰ τῶν ἀετῶν ᾠὰ κάνθαροι διαφθείρουσι.

17T39a Greg. Cypr. 1.57
Ἀετὸν κάνθαρος μαιεύεται [cf. Ar. 17A5]·

ἐπὶ τῶν ὑπό τινων εὐτελῶν πασχόντων. ὁ γὰρ κάνθαρος τὰ τοῦ ἀετοῦ ᾠὰ ἀφανίζει κυλίων.

17T39b id. M 1.55
[idem atque testimonium praecedens]

17T40 Tricl. *in Ach.* 120
[vide Archil. 4T41]

17T41a Tricl. *in Av.* 471b
[vide Ar. 17T16b (Σ)]

17T41b ib. 471c
[vide Ar. 17T16c (Σ)]

17T41c ib. 471dβ
τὸ "πεπάτηκας" ἴσον ἐστὶ τῷ "διέτριψας". Lh

17T41d ib. 471e
[vide Ar. 17T16e (Σ)]

17T41e ib. 472cβ
τὸν κορυδὸν ἔνιοι καὶ κορυδαλὸν λέγουσιν. ἱερὸν δὲ ὄρνεον γῆς νομίζουσιν εἶναι. Lh

17T41f ib. 475b
[vide Ar. 17T16k (Σ)]

17T41g ib. 475d
κατορύξαι] ἤγουν θάψαι. Lh

17T42a Tricl. *in Av.* 651a
νῦν] δή.

17T42b ib. 651b
[vide Archil. 4T25]

17T43a Tricl. *in Av.* 807b
[vide A. 12T11b (Σ)]

17T43b ib. 807c
[vide A. 12T11c (Σ)]

17T43c ib. 808b
[vide A. 12T21c (Tricl.)]

17T44a Tricl. *in Pac.* 129-130β

μῦθος. ἐν τοῖς λόγοις Αἰσώπου φέρεται

ἐχθρεῦσαι ἀετὸν καὶ κάνθαρον. ὁ μὲν γὰρ ἁρπάζων ἦν τοὺς νεοττοὺς τοῦ κανθάρου, ὁ δὲ τὰ ᾠὰ τοῦ ἀετοῦ ἐκκυλίων συνέτριβεν. ὁρῶν οὖν εἰς φθορὰν αὐτοῦ τὸ γένος ἐρχόμενον ἄνεισι πρὸς τὸν Δία καὶ λέγει τὴν συμφοράν. ὁ δὲ τὸν αὐτοῦ οἰκτείρας ὄρνιν ἐπὶ τὸν αὐτοῦ κόλπον νεοττεύειν ἐκέλευσε· καὶ ἦν ἔχων ἐν τοῖς κόλποις ὁ Ζεὺς τὰ ᾠά. τοῦτο μαθὼν ὁ κάνθαρος εἰς οὐρανοὺς ἄνεισι καὶ πρὸς τῇ τοῦ Διὸς ἀνέρχεται κεφαλῇ. ὁ δὲ εὐθὺς ἀναπηδήσας τοῦ θρόνου τὸν κάνθαρον ἀποτινάξασθαι θέλων ἔλαθε τὰ ᾠὰ συντρίψας τοῦ ἀετοῦ. Lh

17T44b ib. 134b

[vide Ar. 17T20c (Σ)]

17T45 Tricl. *in V.* 191d

[vide Ar. 17T22 (Σ)]

17T46a Tricl. *in V.* 1182a

πρὸς τὴν κοινὴν συνήθειαν τοῦ μύθου ποιεῖται τὴν ἀρχήν· "ἦν γέρων καὶ γραῦς". οὕτω... Lh

[quae sequuntur, vide Ar. 17T23a (Σ) καὶ Πλάτων...]

17T46b ib. 1182b

[vide Ar. 17T23b (Σ)]

17T47a Tricl. *in V.* 1401

ἱστορία. Lh

17T47b ib. 1403

[vide Ar. 17T24a (Σ)]

17T47c ib. 1405

[vide Ar. 17T24b (Σ)]

17T48a Tricl. *in V.* 1427

ἅρματος] ἤγουν ἡνιοχῶν. Lh

17T48b ib. 1429

[vide Ar. 17T25b (Σ)]

17T48c ib. 1431a
παροιμία. lh

17T48d ib. 1431b
[vide Ar. 17T25d (Σ)]

17T48e ib. 1431c
[vide Ar. 17T25e (Σ)]

17T48f ib. 1432
[vide Ar. 17T25f (Σ)]

17T49a Tricl. *in V.* 1436a
[vide Ar. 17T26a (Σ)]

17T49b ib. 1437
οὐ'χῖνος] τὸ ἐντελὲς "ὁ ἐχῖνος." Lh

17T49c ib. 1438a
[vide Ar. 17T26b (Σ)]

17T49d ib. 1440b
ἐπίδεσμον] ὥστε δῆσαι τὰ ἕλκη. Lh

17T50a Tricl. *in V.* 1446
[vide Ar. 17T27a (Σ)]

17T50b ib. 1448
[vide Ar. 17T27b (Σ)]

17T51 Macar. 1.36
[sequitur Ar. 17A5: Ἀετὸν κάνθαρος μαιεύσομαι]: ἐπὶ τῶν τιμωρουμένων τοὺς ἄρξαντας.

17T52 Macar. 6.71
[laudatur Ar. 17A6.1431a]

17T53 Apostol. 1.50
Ἀετὸν κάνθαρος μαιεύεται [cf. Ar. 17A5]·
ἐπὶ τῶν κακῶς ὑπό τινων πασχόντων. Τὰ γὰρ ᾠὰ τοῦ ἀετοῦ ἀφανίζει κυλίων ὁ κάνθαρος.

17T54 Apostol. 7.74

Ἔποπος Ἰνδοῦ στοργή· ἐπὶ τῶν ἄγαν φιλούντων προσγενεῖς καὶ φίλους, καὶ ὑπὲρ τούτων θανεῖν αἱρουμένων. Περὶ τοῦ Ἰνδοῦ ἔποπος μῦθόν φασιν οἱ Βραχμᾶνες.

Ἐγένετο παῖς Ἰνδῶν βασιλεῖ, καὶ ἀδελφοὺς εἶχεν, οἵπερ οὖν ἀνδρωθέντες ἐκδικώτατοί τε γίνονται καὶ λεωργότατοι. καὶ τούτου μὲν ὡς νεωτάτου καταφρονοῦσι, τὸν δὲ πατέρα ἐκερτόμουν καὶ τὴν μητέρα, τὸ γῆρας αὐτῶν ἐκφαυλίσαντες· ἀναίνονται οὖν ἐκεῖνοι τὴν σὺν αὐτοῖς διατριβήν, καὶ ᾤχοντο φεύγοντες ὅ τε παῖς καὶ οἱ γέροντες. συντόνου δὲ ἄρα αὐτοὺς πορείας διαδεξαμένης, οἱ μὲν ἀπεῖπον καὶ ἀποθνήσκουσιν, ὁ δὲ παῖς οὐκ ὠλιγώρησεν αὐτῶν, ἀλλ' ἔθαψεν αὐτοὺς ἐν ἑαυτῷ, ξίφει τὴν κεφαλὴν ἀποτεμών. ἀγασθέντα δὲ τὸν πάντ' ἐφορῶντα Ἥλιον τῆς εὐσεβείας τὴν ὑπερβολήν, ὄρνιν αὐτὸν ἀποφῆναι, κάλλιστον μὲν ὄψει, μακραίωνα δὲ τὸν βίον· ὑπανέστηκε δέ οἱ καὶ λόφος ἐκ τῆς κορυφῆς, οἱονεὶ μνημεῖον τοῦτο τῶν πεπραγμένων ὅτε ἔφυγε· τοιαῦτα ἄττα καὶ Ἀθηναῖοι περὶ κορύδου τερατεύονται· ᾧ καὶ Ἀριστοφάνης ἀκολουθεῖ ἐν Ὄρνισι λέγων·

[sequitur Ar. 17F6].

ἔοικεν οὖν ἐξ Ἰνδῶν τὸ μυθολόγημα ἐπ' ἄλλου μὲν ὄρνιθος, ἐπιρρεῦσαι δ' οὖν καὶ τοῖς Ἕλλησιν· ὠγύγιον γάρ τι μῆκος χρόνου λέγουσι Βραχμᾶνες, ἐξ οὗ ταῦτα τῷ ἔποπι τῷ Ἰνδῷ, ἔτι ἀνθρώπῳ ὄντι καὶ παιδὶ τήν γε ἡλικίαν, ἐς τοὺς γειναμένους πέπρακται. [Ar. 17T12 (Ael.)]

17T55 Σ (Ald) *in Pac.* 134a

⟨ᾤ'·⟩ τὸ πλῆρες ὠά. Ald

17T56a Σ (Ald) *in V.* 1436b

κατέαξ' ἐχῖνον· ἄγγος τι (14) (19) χαλκοῦν, ἢ καὶ ἐκ κεράμου, ἃ καθιᾶσιν ... (22) ἐπεδίδουν. (15) τοῦ δ' ἄγγους τούτου καὶ Δημοσθένης [e.g. 54.27] μνημονεύουσι καὶ Ἀριστοτέλης [Ath. 53.2]. ἔστι (17) ... (17) θαλάττιον ὄστρεον. (6) καὶ μὲν δὴ καὶ ... (6) βοός.

17T56b ib. 1438b

τουτέστι τὸν κόρον, τὴν πρὸς (18) ... (1) ὕλην. τοῖς δὲ περὶ Σικελίαν τὸ κατὰ Κόρης ὀμνύειν ἐνεφιλοχώρει. (12) ἐντεῦθεν γὰρ ὁ Ἅιδης αὐτὴν ἁρπάσαι μυθεύεται (13), ὡς οἱ τὰ τοιαῦτά γε ἀλληγορῆσαι δεινοί, διὰ τὸν (13) ... (14) ἀφανισμόν.

17T56c ib. 1440c

ἐπίδεσμος· ὁ ἐπὶ πληγῇ δεσμός.

17T57 Arsen. 1.69

[idem atque Ar. 17T53 (Apostol.)]

17T58a Arsen. 24.51
[idem atque Ar. 17T54 (Apostol.)]

17T58b Arsen. 41.21 (Apostol. 13.61a)
[sequitur Ar. 17F6.Οὐδ'...πεπάτηκας]:
ἐπὶ τῶν μὴ πολυπραγμονούντων καὶ ἀμαθῶν.

17T59 *Mantiss. prov.* 1.2
[sequitur Ar. 17A5: Ἀετὸν κάνθαρος μαιεύσομαι]:
ἐπὶ τῶν τιμωρουμένων τοὺς μείζονας προκατάρξαντας κακοῦ. λέγεται γὰρ τὰ ᾠὰ τοῦ ἀετοῦ ἀφανίζειν ὁ κάνθαρος.

17T60 *Mantiss. prov.* 2.54
Πατῆσαι· ἐνδιατρῖψαι, ἀφικέσθαι. Ἀριστοφάνης·
[sequitur Ar. 17F6.471 (γὰρ om., οὔτ')]
ἐπὶ τῶν ἰδιωτῶν.

17T61 Erasm. *Adag.* 2.2.82
Quam quisque norit artem, in hac se exerceat.
M. Tullius Tusculanarum Quæstionum libro primo: sed hic quidem, quamvis eruditus sit, sicut est, hæc magistro concedat Aristoteli, canere ipse doceat. Bene enim illo proverbio Graecorum præcipitur,
Quam quisque norit artem, in hac se exerceat.
Hactenus Cicero. Est autem senarius Jambicus, admonens, ut quarum rerum sumus periti, in his duntaxat disputandis tractandisque versemur: quarum vero sumus rudes, eas doctioribus concedamus, neque professionem alienam nobis vindicemus, neque in messem alienam mittamus falcem, neve sutores ultra crepidam judicemus. Apud A. Gellium Plato ex Euripide citat, sed in sensum non nihil diversum a Ciceroniano, nempe suo quemque vitæ instituto studioque impense delectari, quod in eo se laudem aliquam assecutum confidat. Accidit, inquit, illis illud Euripidis: Qua in re clarus quisque est, ad eam properat, & diei partem illi plurimam impertit, in qua ipse se exsuperet: contra, in qua stupidior ac nihil sit, inde effugit, eamque contemnit. Porro versus, quem Latine refert M. Tullius, est apud Aristophanem in fabula, cui titulus, Σφῆκες*: is est ejusmodi:*
[sequitur Ar. 17F3.1431 (εἰδείη)]
i.e. Quam quisque novit artem, in hac se exercitet.
Quoquidem loco Interpres admonet inter proverbia celebrari. Usurpavit Stratonicus citharædus apud Athenæum libro VIII. Qui musico cupiam, qui prius fuerat ditor, de harmonia cum ipso disputans respondit, Ἔρδοι τις ἣν ἕκαστος εἰδείη τέχνην. *Quanquam in editione Aldina legitur.*

17T62 Erasm. *Adag.* 2.3.77 (p. 514)
Leonis catulum ne alas.
Æschyli sententia proverbialis refertur apud Aristophanem in Ranis:
[sequitur Ar. 17A6]

i.e. Catulum ne alas leonis in republica,

Ac maxime ipsum ne leonem alas ibi,

Quod si quis alitus, obsequendum moribus.

Refert hunc locum Valerius Maximus lib. 7. capite de Sapienter Dictis [Ar. 17T4]. *Admonet ænigma, non esse fovendam potentiam, quæ leges possit opprimere: quod si forte talis quispiam exstiterit, non esse e Rep. decertare cum illo, quem nequeas nisi magno Rep. malo devincere. Tyrannus aut ferendus est, aut non recipiendus.*

17T63a Erasm. *Adag.* 2.6.27

Ne Æsopum quidem trivisti.

Οὐδὲ τὸν Αἴσωπον πεπάτηκας. *i.e.* Ne Æsopum quidem trivisti. *De vehementer stupidis & imperitis. Refertur a Suida. Exstat autem apud Aristophanem in Avibus:*

[sequitur Ar. 17F6.471]

i.e. Indoctus enim es, neque sat solers,

Neque trivisti saltem Æsopum.

Nam antiquitus Æsopi fabellas etiam vulgus idiotarum tenebat. Has igitur qui non legisset, nihil scire videbatur. Erat autem natione Phryx, servus Xanthi, liber factus est ab Idmone caeco. Plato comœdiarum scriptor, fingit illum revixisse. Ab hoc omnes fabellæ in quibus inducuntur animalia bruta, Αἰσωποποιητοὶ *dicuntur; quemadmodum in quibus homines, Sybariticæ, sive Sybaritides diminutive.*

17T63b ib. 3.3.67 (p. 797DE)

Meminit Corydi Aristophanes in Avibus [17F6], *affingens ex Æsopo lepidam fabulam. Ait enim*

hanc fuisse omnium antiquissimam, videlicet ante natam, quam esset terra, quumque pater illius morbo perisset, nec esset sepulcro locus, in capite sepelisse patrem, unde & crista tumuli loco est.

Inibi Corydo regnum decernitur.

17T64a Erasm. *Adag.* 3.7.1 (p. 869)

Scarabeus aquilam quærit.

Κάνθαρος ἀετὸν μαίεται. i.e. Scarabeus aquilam quærit. *Cum imbecillior, atque impotentior, mali quippiam molitur, struitque insidias inimico longe potentiori. Est & altera lectio, atque ea, meo quidem judicio, verior: Ὁ κάνθαρος ἀετὸν μαιεύεται. i.e.* Scarabeus aquilæ obstetricatur. *Sensus ferme idem est, sive legas* μαίεται *sive* μαιεύεται. *Competit enim in hominem & imbecillum, qui viribus longe præpollenti, maliciosis insidiis, & clancularis dolis perniciem machinatur. Aristophanes in Lysistrata:*

[sequitur Ar. 17A5.694 ὑπερχολῶ-695]

i.e. Supra modum irascor tibi, scarbeus aquilam ego te,

Quando ova paries obstetrix juvabo.

Super hac re fertur apologus quidam apud Graecos non inelegans, quem Lucianus indicat Æsopicum esse, cum ait in Icaromenippo [10], *fabulatum fuisse Æsopum, quemadmodum aliquando scarabei & cameli cœlum conscenderint. Porro quod ad fabulam scarabei*

& aquilæ attinet, ad hunc habet modum: Est jam olim aquilarum genero, cum universa scarabeorum gente, vertus atque antiqua simultas, ac bellum prorsus internecinum, planeque, quod Graeci solent dicere, ἄσπονδος πόλεμος, Nam odio dissident plusquam Vatiniano, adeo ut ne Juppiter quidem ipse, οὗ κράτος ἐστὶ μέγιστον, & qui totum nutu tremefactat Olympum, rem inter eos componere, ac dissidium finire potuerit, si modo vera narrant apologi. Denique nihilo magis inter eos convenit, quam hodie quoque convenit inter Deos istos aulicos, & humilem obscuramque plebem. Sed erit fortassis, qui Æsopicarum fabularum rudis & ἀνήκοος admiretur, quid tandem negocii sit cum aquila scarabeo.

17T64b ibid. (p. 883)

Sed ut ad proverbiorum negocium redeamus, Meminit hujus fabulæ Comicus Aristophanes ἐν Εἰρήνῃ, his quidem versibus:

[sequitur Ar. 17A2.129-134 (πετεινῶν)]
i.e. In fabulis id est repertum Æsopicis,
Adiisse divos unicum e volucribus.
Haud credibilem ais fabulam, O pater pater,
Adiisse divos animal obscœnum atque olens.
Pervenit olim, inquam, ob simultatem asperam,
Quæ illi fuit cum aquila, ova volvens illius,
Et expetens pœnas ab hoste mutuas.

Admonet autem apologus, non esse cuiquam contemnendum hostem, quamvis infima fortuna. Sunt enim homunculi quidam, infimæ quidem fortis, sed tamen malitiosi, non minus atri, quam Scarabei, neque minus putidi, neque minus abjecti, qui tamen pertinaci quadam ingenii malitia, cum nulli omnino mortalium prodesse possint, magnis etiam sæpenumero viris facessant negocium. Territant nigrore, obstrepunt stridore, obturbant fœtore, circumvolitant, hærent, insidiantur, ut non paulo satius sit, cum magnis aliquando viris simultatem suscipere, quam hos lacessere Scarabeos, quos pudeat etiam visisse, quosque nec excutere possis, neque conflictari cum illis queas, nisi discedas contaminatior.

17F1 Ar. *V.* 1182

ΒΔΕΛΥΚΛΕΩΝ
"Αγε νυν, ἐπιστήσει λόγους σεμνοὺς λέγειν
ἀνδρῶν παρόντων πολυμαθῶν καὶ δεξιῶν;
ΦΙΛΟΚΛΕΩΝ
"Εγωγε.
ΒΔ. Τίνα δῆτ' ἂν λέγοις;
ΦΙ. Πολλοὺς πάνυ.
Πρῶτον μὲν ὡς ἡ Λάμι' ἁλοῦσ' ἐπέρδετο,
ἔπειτα δ' ὡς ὁ Καρδοπίων τὴν μητέρα-
ΒΔ. Μή μοί γε μύθους, ἀλλὰ τῶν ἀνθρωπικῶν,
οἵους λέγομεν μάλιστα, τοὺς κατ' οἰκίαν.
ΦΙ. Ἐγῷδα τοίνυν τῶν γε πάνυ κατ' οἰκίαν
ἐκεῖνον ὡς
"Οὕτω ποτ' ἦν μῦς καὶ γαλῆ."

ΒΔ. Ὦ σκαιὲ κἀπαίδευτε, Θεογένης ἔφη
τῷ κοπρολόγῳ καὶ ταῦτα λοιδορούμενος,
μῦς καὶ γαλᾶς μέλλεις λέγειν ἐν ἀνδράσιν;
ΦΙ. Ποίοις τινὰς δὲ χρὴ λέγειν;
ΒΔ. Μεγαλοπρεπεῖς,
ὡς ξυνεθεώρεις Ἀνδροκλεῖ καὶ Κλεισθένει.

17F2 Ar. *V.* 1399-1405

ΓΥΝΗ
Ἴθι μοι παράστηθ', ἀντιβολῶ, πρὸς τῶν θεῶν.
Ὁδὶ γὰρ ἀνήρ ἐστιν ὅς μ' ἀπώλεσεν
τῇ δᾳδὶ παίων, κἀξέβαλεν ἐντευθενὶ
ἄρτους δέκ' ὀβολῶν κἀπιθήκην τεττάρων.
ΒΔΕΛΥΚΛΕΩΝ
Ὁρᾷς ἃ δέδρακας; Πράγματ' αὖ δεῖ καὶ δίκας
ἔχειν διὰ τὸν σὸν οἶνον.
ΦΙΛΟΚΛΕΩΝ
Οὐδαμῶς γ', ἐπεὶ
λόγοι διαλλάξουσιν αὐτὰ δεξιοί·
ὥστ' οἶδ' ὁτιὴ ταύτῃ διαλλαχθήσομαι.
ΓΥ. Οὔτοι μὰ τὼ θεὼ καταπροίξει Μυρτίας
τῆς Ἀγκυλίωνος θυγατέρος καὶ Σωστράτης,
οὕτω διαφθείρας ἐμοῦ τὰ φορτία.
ΦΙ. Ἄκουσον, ὦ γύναι· λόγον σοι βούλομαι
λέξαι χαρίεντα.
ΓΥ. Μὰ Δία μή μοι γ', ὦ μέλε.
ΦΙ. Αἴσωπον ἀπὸ δείπνου βαδίζονθ' ἑσπέρας
θρασεῖα καὶ μεθύση τις ὑλάκτει κύων.
Κἄπειτ' ἐκεῖνος εἶπεν· Ὦ κύον, κύον,
εἰ νὴ Δί', ἀντὶ τῆς κακῆς γλώττης ποθὲν
πυροὺς πρίαιο, σωφρονεῖν ἄν μοι δοκεῖς."
ΓΥ. Καὶ καταγελᾷς μου; Προσκαλοῦμαί σ' ὅστις εἶ
πρὸς τοὺς ἀγορανόμους βλάβης τῶν φορτίων,
κλητῆρ' ἔχουσα Χαιρεφῶντα τουτονί.
ΦΙ. Μά Δί', ἀλλ ἄκουσον, ἤν τί σοι δόξω λέγειν.
Λᾶσός ποτ ἀντεδίδασκε καὶ Σιμωνίδης·
ἔπειθ' ὁ Λᾶσος εἶπεν· "Ὀλίγον μοι μέλει."
ΓΥ. Ἄληθες, οὗτος;
ΦΙ. Καὶ σὺ δή μοι, Χαιρεφῶν,
γυναικὶ κλητεύειν ἔοικας θαψίνῃ,
Ἰνοῖ κρεμαμένῃ πρὸς ποδῶν Εὐριπίδου.
[sequuntur Ar. 17F3-5]

17F3 Ar. *V.* 1427-1432

[praecedit Ar. 17F2]

ΒΔΕΛΥΚΛΕΩΝ
'Οδί τις ἕτερος, ὡς ἔοικεν, ἔρχεται
καλούμενός σε· τόν γέ τοι κλητῆρ' ἔχει.
ΑΝΗΡ
Οἴμοι κακοδαίμων. Προσκαλοῦμαί σ', ὦ γέρον,
ὕβρεως.
ΒΔ. Ὕβρεως; Μή, μὴ καλέσῃ, πρὸς τῶν θεῶν·
Ἐγὼ γὰρ ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ δίκην δίδωμί σοι,
ἣν ἂν σὺ τάξῃς, καὶ χάριν πρὸς εἴσομαι.
ΦΙΛΟΚΛΕΩΝ
Ἐγὼ μὲν οὖν αὐτῷ διαλλαχθήσομαι
ἑκών· ὁμολογῶ γὰρ πατάξαι καὶ βαλεῖν.
Ἀλλ' ἐλθὲ δευρί· πότερον ἐπιτρέπεις ἐμοὶ
ὅ τι χρή μ' ἀποτείσαντ' ἀργύριον τοῦ πράγματος
εἶναι φίλον τὸ λοιπόν, ἢ σύ μοι φράσεις;
ΑΝ. Σὺ λέγε. Δικῶν γὰρ οὐ δέομ' οὐδὲ πραγμάτων.
ΦΙ. Ἀνὴρ Συβαρίτης ἐξέπεσεν ἐξ ἅρματος,
καί πως κατεάγη τῆς κεφαλῆς μέγα σφόδρα·
ἐτύγχανεν γὰρ οὐ τρίβων ὢν ἱππικῆς.
Κἄπειτ' ἐπιστὰς εἶπ' ἀνὴρ αὐτῷ φίλος·
"Ἔρδοι τις ἣν ἕκαστος εἰδείη τέχνην."
Οὕτω δὲ καὶ σὺ παράτρεχ' εἰς τὰ Πιττάλου.
ΒΔ. Ὅμοιά σου καὶ ταῦτα τοῖς ἄλλοις τρόποις.
ΑΝ. Ἀλλ' οὖν σὺ μέμνησ' οὗτος ἀπεκρίνατο.
[sequuntur Ar. 17F4-5]

17F4 Ar. *V.* 1435-1440

[praecedunt Ar. 17F2-3]

ΦΙΛΟΚΛΕΩΝ
Ἄκουε, μὴ φεῦγ'.
Ἐν Συβάρει γυνή ποτε
κατέαξ' ἐχῖνον.
ΑΝΗΡ Ταῦτ' ἐγὼ μαρτύρομαι.
ΦΙ. Οὑχῖνος οὖν ἔχων τιν' ἐπεμαρτύρατο·
εἶθ' ἡ Συβαρῖτις εἶπεν· Εἰ ναὶ τὰν Κόραν
τὴν μαρτυρίαν ταύτην ἐάσας ἐν τάχει
ἐπίδεσμον ἐπρίω, νοῦν ἂν εἶχες πλείονα."
ΑΝ. Ὕβριζ', ἕως ἂν τὴν δίκην ἄρχων καλῇ.
[sequitur Ar. 17F5]

17F5 Ar. *V.* 1448

[praecedunt Ar. 17F2-4]

ΒΔΕΛΥΚΛΕΩΝ

Οὔτοι μὰ τὴν Δήμητρ' ἔτ' ἐνταυθοῖ μενεῖς,
ἀλλ' ἀράμενος εἴσω σε-

ΦΙΛΟΚΛΕΩΝ

Τί ποεῖς;

ΒΔ. Ὅ τι ποιῶ;
εἴσω φέρω σ' ἐντεῦθεν· εἰ δὲ μή, τάχα
κλητῆρες ἐπιλείψουσι τοὺς καλουμένους.

ΦΙ. Αἴσωπον οἱ Δελφοί ποτ'-

ΒΔ. Ὀλίγον μοι μέλει.

ΦΙ. φιάλην ἐπῃτιῶντο κλέψαι τοῦ θεοῦ·
ὁ δ' ἔλεξεν αὐτοῖς, ὡς
ὁ κάνθαρός ποτε-

ΒΔ. Οἴμ' ὡς ἀπολῶ σ' αὐτοῖσι τοῖσι κανθάροις.

17F6 Ar. *Av.* 471-475

ΧΟΡΟΣ

Ἀλλ' ἐφ' ὅτῳπερ πράγματι τὴν σὴν ἥκεις γνώμην ἀναπείσας,
λέγε θαρρήσας· ὡς τὰς σπονδὰς οὐ μὴ πρότερον παραβῶμεν.

ΠΙΣΘΕΤΑΙΡΟΣ

Καὶ μὴν ὀργῶ νὴ τὸν Δία καὶ προπεφύραται λόγος εἷς μοι,
ὃν διαμάττειν οὐ κωλύει. Φέρε, παῖ, στέφανον· καταχεῖσθαι
κατὰ χειρὸς ὕδωρ φερέτω ταχύ τις.

ΕΥΕΛΠΙΔΗΣ

Δειπνήσειν μέλλομεν; Ἤ τι;

ΠΙ. Μὰ Δί' ἀλλὰ λέγειν ζητῶ τι πάλαι, μέγα καὶ λαρινὸν ἔπος τι,
ὅ τι τὴν τούτων θραύσει ψυχήν. Οὕτως ὑμῶν ὑπεραλγῶ,
οἵτινες ὄντες πρότερον βασιλῆς-

ΧΟ. Ἡμεῖς βασιλῆς; τίνος;

ΠΙ. Ὑμεῖς
πάντων ὁπόσ' ἔστιν, ἐμοῦ πρῶτον, τουδί, καὶ τοῦ Διὸς αὐτοῦ,
ἀρχαιότεροι πρότεροί τε Κρόνου καὶ Τιτάνων ἐγένεσθε,
καὶ Γῆς.

ΧΟ. Καὶ Γῆς;

ΠΙ. Νὴ τὸν Ἀπόλλω.

ΧΟ. Τουτὶ μὰ Δί' οὐκ ἐπεπύσμην.

ΠΙ. Ἀμαθὴς γὰρ ἔφυς κοὐ πολυπράγμων, οὐδ' Αἴσωπον πεπάτηκας,
ὃς ἔφασκε λέγων
κορυδὸν πάντων πρώτην ὄρνιθα γενέσθαι,
προτέραν τῆς γῆς, κἄπειτα νόσῳ τὸν πατέρ' αὐτῆς ἀποθνῄσκειν·
γῆν δ' οὐκ εἶναι, τὸν δὲ προκεῖσθαι πεμπταῖον· τὴν δ' ἀποροῦσαν

ὑπ' ἀμηχανίας τὸν πατέρ' αὐτῆς ἐν τῇ κεφαλῇ κατορύξαι.
ΕΥ. Ὁ πατὴρ ἄρα τῆς κορυδοῦ νυνὶ κεῖται τεθνέως Κεφαλῆσιν.
ΠΙ. Οὔκουν δῆτ' εἰ πρότεροι μὲν γῆς, πρότεροι δὲ θεῶν ἐγένοντο,
ὡς πρεσβυτάτων ὄντων αὐτῶν ὀρθῶς ἐσθ' ἡ βασιλεία;
ΕΥ. Νὴ τὸν Ἀπόλλω. Πάνυ τοίνυν χρὴ ῥύγχος βόσκειν σε τὸ λοιπόν·
οὐκ ἀποδώσει ταχέως ὁ Ζεὺς τὸ σκῆπτρον τῷ δρυκολάπτῃ.

17A1 Ar. *Ach.* 120

ΔΙΚΑΙΟΠΟΛΙΣ
Καὶ τοῖν μὲν εὐνούχοιν τὸν ἕτερον τουτονὶ
ἐγῷδ' ὅς ἐστι, Κλεισθένης ὁ Σιβυρτίου.
Ὦ θερμόβουλον πρωκτὸν ἐξυρημένε.
Τοιόνδε δ', ὦ πίθηκε, τὸν πώγων' ἔχων
εὐνοῦχος ἡμῖν ἦλθες ἐσκευασμένος;

17A2 Ar. *Pax* 127-134

ΠΑΙΔΙΟΝ Ὦ πάτερ, ὦ πάτερ, ἆρ' ἔτυμός γε
δώμασιν ἡμετέροις φάτις ἥκει,
ὡς σὺ μετ' ὀρνίθων προλιπὼν ἐμὲ
ἐς κόρακας βαδιεῖ μεταμώνιος;
Ἔστι τι τῶνδ' ἐτύμως; εἴπ', ὦ πάτερ, εἴ τι φιλεῖς με.
ΤΡΥΓΑΙΟΣ
Δοξάσαι ἔστι, κόραι· τὸ δ' ἐτήτυμον, ἄχθομαι ὑμῖν,
ἡνίκ' ⟨ἂν⟩ αἰτίζητ' ἄρτον πάππαν με καλοῦσαι,
ἔνδον δ' ἀργυρίου μηδὲ ψακὰς ᾖ πάνυ πάμπαν.
Ἢν δ' ἐγὼ εὖ πράξας ἔλθω πάλιν, ἕξετ' ἐν ὥρᾳ
κολλύραν μεγάλην καὶ κόνδυλον ὄψον ἐπ' αὐτῇ.
ΠΑ. Καὶ τίς πόρος σοι τῆς ὁδοῦ γενήσεται;
Ναῦς μὲν γὰρ οὐκ ἄξει σε ταύτην τὴν ὁδόν.
ΤΡ. Πτηνὸς πορεύει πῶλος· οὐ ναυσθλώσομαι.
ΠΑ. Τίς δ' ἡπίνοιά σοὐστὶν ὥστε κάνθαρον
ζεύξαντ' ἐλαύνειν εἰς θεούς, ὦ παππία;
ΤΡ. Ἐν τοῖσιν Αἰσώπου λόγοις ἐξηυρέθη
μόνος πετηνῶν εἰς θεοὺς ἀφιγμένος.
ΠΑ. Ἄπιστον εἶπας μῦθον, ὦ πάτερ πάτερ,
ὅπως κάκοσμον ζῷον ἦλθεν εἰς θεούς.
ΤΡ. Ἦλθεν κατ' ἔχθραν αἰετοῦ πάλαι ποτέ,
ᾠ' ἐκκυλίνδων κἀντιτιμωρούμενος.
ΠΑ. Οὐκοῦν ἐχρῆν σε Πηγάσου ζεῦξαι πτερόν,
ὅπως ἐφαίνου τοῖς θεοῖς τραγικώτερος.
ΤΡ. Ἀλλ', ὦ μέλ', ἄν μοι σιτίων διπλῶν ἔδει·
νῦν δ' ἅττ' ἂν αὐτὸς καταφάγω τὰ σιτία,
τούτοισι τοῖς αὐτοῖσι τοῦτον χορτάσω.
ΠΑ. Τί δ', ἢν ἐς ὑγρὸν πόντιον πέσῃ βάθος;
Πῶς ἐξολισθεῖν πτηνὸς ὢν δυνήσεται;

ΤΡ. Ἐπίτηδες εἶχον πηδάλιον, ᾧ χρήσομαι·
τὸ δὲ πλοῖον ἔσται Ναξιουργὴς κάνθαρος.
ΠΑ. Λιμὴν δὲ τίς σε δέξεται φορούμενον;
ΤΡ. Ἐν Πειραιεῖ δήπου ᾽στὶ Κανθάρου λιμήν.

17A3 Ar. *Av.* 651-653

ΕΠΟΨ
Καὶ μὴν μὰ τὸν Δί᾽ οὐχὶ νυστάζειν ἔτι
ὥρα᾽ στὶν ἡμῖν οὐδὲ μελλονικιᾶν,
ἀλλ᾽ ὡς τάχιστα δεῖ τι δρᾶν. Πρῶτον δέ τοι
εἰσέλθετ᾽ εἰς νεοττιάν τε τὴν ἐμὴν
καὶ τἀμὰ κάρφη καὶ τὰ παρόντα φρύγανα,
καὶ τοὔνομ᾽ ἡμῖν φράσατον.
ΠΙΣΘΕΤΑΙΡΟΣ
Ἀλλὰ ῥᾴδιον.
Ἐμοὶ μὲν ὄνομα Πισθέταιρος, τῳδεδὶ
Εὐελπίδης Κριῶθεν.
ΕΠ. Ἀλλὰ χαίρετον
ἄμφω.
ΠΙ. Δεχόμεθα.
ΕΠ. Δεῦρο τοίνυν εἴσιτον.
ΠΙ. Ἴωμεν· εἰσηγοῦ σὺ λαβὼν ἡμᾶς.
ΕΠ. Ἴθι.
ΠΙ. Ἀτάρ, τὸ δεῖνα, δεῦρ᾽ ἐπανάκρουσαι πάλιν.
Φέρ᾽ ἴδω, φράσον νῷν, πῶς ἐγώ τε χοὐτοσὶ
ξυνεσόμεθ᾽ ὑμῖν πετομένοις οὐ πετομένω;
ΕΡ. Καλῶς.
ΠΙ. Ὅρα νυν, ὡς ἐν Αἰσώπου λόγοις
ἐστὶν λεγόμενον δή τι,
τὴν ἀλώπεχ᾽, ὡς
φλαύρως ἐκοινώνησεν αἰετῷ ποτε.
ΕΠ. Μηδὲν φοβηθῇς· ἔστι γάρ τι ῥιζίον,
ὃ διατραγόντ᾽ ἔσεσθον ἐπτερωμένω.
ΠΙ. Οὕτω μὲν εἰσίωμεν. ...

17A4 Ar. *Av.* 807-808

ΠΙΣΘΕΤΑΙΡΟΣ
Ταυτὶ τοιαυτί.
ΕΥΕΛΠΙΔΗΣ
Μὰ Δί᾽ ἐγὼ μὲν πρᾶγμά πω
γελοιότερον οὐκ εἶδον οὐδεπώποτε.
ΠΙ. Ἐπὶ τῷ γελᾷς;
ΕΥ. Ἐπὶ τοῖσι σοῖς ὠκυπτέροις.
Οἶσθ᾽ ᾧ μάλιστ᾽ ἔοικας ἐπτερωμένος;
ΠΙ. Εἰς εὐτέλειαν χηνὶ σύ γε γεγραμμένῳ.
ΕΥ. Σὺ δὲ κοψίχῳ γε σκάφιον ἀποτετιλμένῳ.

ΠΙ. Ταυτὶ μὲν ᾐκάσμεθα κατὰ τὸν Αἰσχύλον
"Τάδ' οὐχ ὑπ' ἄλλων, ἀλλὰ τοῖς αὑτῶν πτεροῖς."

17A5 Ar. *Lys.* 695

ΧΟΡΟΣ ΓΥΝΑΙΚΩΝ Εἰ νὴ τὼ θεώ με ζωπυ-
ρήσεις, λύσω τὴν ἐμαυτῆς
ὗν ἐγὼ δή, καὶ ποήσω
τήμερον τοὺς δημότας βωστρείν σ' ἐγώ πεκτούμενον.
'Αλλὰ χἠμεῖς, ὦ γυναῖκες, θᾶττον ἐκδυώμεθα,
ὡς ἂν ὄζωμεν γυναικῶν αὐτοδὰξ ὠργισμένων.
Νῦν πρὸς ἔμ' ἴτω τις, ἵνα μήποτε φά-
γῃ σκόροδα, μηδὲ κυάμους μέλανας.
'Ως εἰ καὶ μόνον κακῶς ἐρεῖς, -ὑπερχολῶ γάρ,-
αἰετὸν τίκτοντα κάνθαρός σε μαιεύσομαι.

17A6 Ar. *Ra.* 1431-1432

ΔΙΟΝΥΣΟΣ
Πρῶτον μὲν οὖν περὶ 'Αλκιβιάδου τίν' ἔχετον
γνώμην ἑκάτερος; 'Η πόλις γὰρ δυστοκεῖ.
ΕΥΡΙΠΙΔΗΣ
Ἔχει δὲ περὶ αὐτοῦ τίνα γνώμην;
ΔΙ. Τίνα;
Ποθεῖ μὲν, ἐχθαίρει δέ, βούλεται δ' ἔχειν.
'Αλλ' ὅ τι νοεῖτον εἴπατον τούτου πέρι.
ΕΥ. Μισῶ πολίτην, ὅστις ὠφελεῖν πάτραν
βραδὺς φανεῖται, μεγάλα δὲ βλάπτειν ταχύς,
καὶ πόριμον αὑτῷ, τῇ πόλει δ' ἀμήχανον.
ΔΙ. Εὖ γ' ὦ Πόσειδον. Σὺ δὲ τίνα γνώμην ἔχεις;
ΑΙΣΧΥΛΟΣ
[Οὐ χρὴ λέοντος σκύμνον ἐν πόλει τρέφειν.]
Μάλιστα μὲν λέοντα μὴ ἂν πόλει τρέφειν·
ἢν δ' ἐκτραφῇ τις, τοῖς τρόποις ὑπηρετεῖν.
ΔΙ. Νὴ τὸν Δία τὸν σωτῆρα, δυσκρίτως ἔχω·
ὁ μὲν σοφῶς γὰρ εἶπεν, ὁ δ' ἕτερος σαφῶς.

18. *Apollophanes*

18T1 Ael. *NA* 6.51
[vide 8T2]

18F1 Apolloph. fr. 9 *PCG*
[= 18T1]

19. *Strattis*

19T1 Zen. 2.93
Γαλῇ χιτώνιον· ὁμοία ἡ παροιμία αὕτῃ τῇ· Οὐ πρέπει γαλῇ κροκωτόν. Ἐπειδὴ
γαλῆ κατὰ πρόνοιαν Ἀφροδίτης γυνὴ γενομένη ἐν χιτῶνι κροκωτῷ οὖσα ἐπέδραμε μυί.
Μέμνηται ταύτης Στράττις.

19A1 Stratt. fr. 75 *PCG*?
[vide Stratt. 19T1]

20. *Callimachus*

20T1 Trypho (I), *Trop.* 2.24 (III 206 Spengel)
Ἀστεισμός ἐστι λόγος ἀφ' ἑαυτοῦ διασυρτικὸς γενόμενος, ὡς εἴ τις πλουτῶν λέγει, ἐγὼ δέ εἰμι πάντων πενέστατος, καὶ ὁ πάντας καταπαλαίων λέγει ὑπὸ πάντων πίπτειν. παρὰ δὲ Καλλιμάχῳ
ἀστεϊζομένη ἡ ἐλαία φησίν,
[sequitur Call. 20F2, fr. 194.13 Pfeiffer]
καλεῖται δὲ τοῦτο καὶ προσποίησις.

20T2 Luc. Tarrh. fr. 1 Linnenkugel
[praecedit Luc. Tarrh. G21]
...παρὰ Καλλιμάχῳ
[sequitur Call. 20F2, fr. 194.6-8 Pfeiffer ἄκουε...θέσθαι (ἐλαίη†ν εἰκὸς†)],
καὶ τὰ ἑξῆς.
[pergit Luc. Tarrh. G21]

20T3 Apollon. *Lex.* *s.v.* ἄειδε
ἄειδε ᾆδε, ὕμνει, δύναμιν περιποίησαι ὥστε ᾆσαι· "μῆνιν ἄειδε θεά" [Il. Α 1[1]]. τινὲς δὲ εἰς τὸ λέγειν μετέβαλον τὴν λέξιν ἐπὶ μὲν τῶν καταλογάδην προφερομένων τῷ λέγε καταχρωμένου καὶ τῷ εἰπεῖν, τῷ δὲ ἄειδεν δὲ ὀπὶ μὲν μετ' ᾠδῆς· "ἀλλ' ἄγε δὴ μετάβηθι καὶ ἵππου κόσμον ἄειδε" [Od. θ 492].
[sequitur Call. 20F1.15 ταῦτα-17]
ἀντὶ τοῦ λέγοντα· ὁ γὰρ Αἴσωπος λογοποιός.

20T4 Herenn. Ph. fr. 32 Palmieri
[idem atque Call. 20T4 (Luc. Tarrh.)]

20T5 Ps.-Diogenian. *Praef.* (pp. 178-179 Leutsch-Schneidewin)

[praecedit Ps.-Diogenian. G28]
[sequitur Call. 20F2, fr. 194.6-8 θέσθαι Pfeiffer (ἔγ)].
[sequitur Hom. 1T2]

20T6 Clem. Al. *Strom.* 5.8.48

Ἀπολλόδωρος δ' ὁ Κερκυραῖος τοὺς στίχους τούσδε ὑπὸ Βράγχου ἀναφωνηθῆναι τοῦ μάντεως λέγει Μιλησίους καθαίροντος ἀπὸ λοιμοῦ. ὃ μὲν γὰρ ἐπιρραίνων τὸ πλῆθος δάφνης κλάδοις προκατήρχετο τοῦ ὕμνου ὧδέ πως· 'μέλπετε, ὦ παῖδες, Ἑκάεργον καὶ Ἑκαέργαν', ἐπέψαλλεν δ' ὡς εἰπεῖν ὁ λαός· 'βέδυ, ζάψ, χθώμ, πλῆκτρον, σφίγξ· κναξζβίχ, θύπτης, φλεγμό, δρώψ.' μέμνηται τῆς ἱστορίας καὶ Καλλίμαχος ἐν ἰάμβοις [20F2.28-31]. κναξζβὶχ δὲ κατὰ παραγωγὴν ἡ νόσος παρὰ τὸ ναίειν καὶ διαφθείρειν.

20T7 Clem. Al. *Strom.* 5.14.100

Ἐπί τε τῆς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐκ χοὸς διαπλάσεως ἱστάμενοι γήϊνον μὲν οἱ φιλόσοφοι παρ' ἕκαστα τὸ σῶμα ἀναγορεύουσιν, Ὅμηρος δὲ οὐκ ὀκνεῖ ἐν κατάρας μέρει τίθεσθαι τό· ἀλλ' ὑμεῖς μὲν πάντες ὕδωρ καὶ γαῖα γένοισθε [Il. H 99], καθάπερ Ἡσαΐας ἄκαὶ καταπατήσατε αὐτούς, λέγων, ὡς πηλόν' [LXX, *Is.* 41.25, cf. 10.6]. 100 Καλλίμαχος δὲ διαρρήδην γράφει·

[sequitur Call. 20F1, fr. 192.1-3 Pfeiffer]

Πάλιν τε ὁ αὐτός· εἴ σε (ἔφη) Προμηθεὺς | ἔπλασε καὶ πηλοῦ μὴ 'ξ ἑτέρου γέγονας [fr. 493 Pfeiffer],...

20T8 Eus. *PE* 13.13.23

[laudatur Call. 20T7 (Clem. Al.)]

20T9 *Dieg.* 6.22-32

[laudatur Call. 20F1, fr. 192.1 Pfeiffer]

Τἆλλ[α] ζῷα ὡμοφώνει ἀν[θ]ρώποις, μέχρι κατὰ λύσιν γήρως ἐπ[ρέ]σβευσεν ὁ κύκνος πρὸς τοὺς θεοὺς καὶ ἀλώπηξ τὸν Δία ἐτόλμησεν μὴ δικαίως ἄρχειν φάναι. ἔκτοτε δὲ εἰς ἀνθρώπους μετήνεγκεν αὐτῶν τὴν φωνήν, καὶ λάλοι ἐγένοντο· Εὔδημος δέ, φησίν, τὴν κυνὸς ἔσχε, Φίλτων δὲ ὄνου,

παρεπικόπτων
τούτους, ἴσως δὲ καὶ Σαρδιανὸν εἶπε
τὸν Αἴσωπον.

20T10 *Dieg.* **7.1-18**

[laudatur Call. 20F2, fr. 194.1 Pfeiffer]
Διεφέρετο ὁ ποιητὴς πρός τινα τῶν ἐφαμίλλων· Σίμος δέ τις παρατυχὼν παρυπέκρουεν ἄμφω παρενδεικνύμενος ἴσος εἶναι. Θρᾷκα δέ φησιν αὐτὸν καθεστάναι ⟨-⟩ παιδοκλέπτης ἐστί. καὶ γὰρ τὸν αἶνον παρατίθεται ἀκόλουθον, ὡς

ἐν Τμώλῳ ⟨δάφνη καὶ⟩ ἐλαία διεφέροντο ὑπὲρ πρωτείων (παρεπεφύκεσαν δ' ἀλλήλαις), διεξῄεσαν δὲ τὰ προσόντα ἑαυταῖς χρήσιμα. ἐπὶ πλεῖον δὲ διαφερομένων ὑποτυχοῦσα βάτος παλαιά· 'πέπαυθε πρὶν εἰ μὴ ἐ[π]ίχαρτοι ⟨τοῖ⟩ς δυσ[μ]ενέσι γενώμεθα' (π[αρ]επεφύκ̣[ει δ' αὐ]τ̣αῖς). πρ]ὸς ἣν ἀποβλέψασα [.........] ἡ δαφν]η [sequitur Call. 20F2, fr. 194.102 Pfeiffer ὦ-], φη[σίν], [ibid.103
-σ[ύ;] ...]σεικο[......]ο̣υε
..]ι̣νητ̣[...]α̣τωδ̣ρα[......]εισεις

20T11 Choer. ***epimer. in Ps.*** **(III 114 Gaisford)**

[praecedit Archil. 4T28]
...ἀπὸ δὲ φυτῶν, ὡς παρὰ Καλλιμάχῳ,
[sequitur Call. 20F2.6 ἄκουε...αἶνον^λόγον]

20T12 ***Et. Gud. s.v.*** **αἶνος (p. 48.21-23 De Stefani)**

[praecedunt Archil. 4T33a, 4T34 Hes. 2T33]
...· ἀπὸ δὲ φυτῶν, ὡς παρὰ Καλλιμάχῳ
[sequitur Call. 20F2, fr. 194.6-8 Pfeiffer ...θέσθαι]
καὶ τὰ ἑξῆς. καὶ ἔστιν ὁ αἶνος ἐξηπλωμένη παροιμία καὶ μετὰ διηγήσεως ἀ[παρτίζουσα τὸ νοούμενον πρὸς παραμυθίαν τε καὶ ὠφέλειαν] ἀνθρώπων· π⟦αροιμία δὲ τὴν ἀπὸ⟧ κεφαλαίου ⟦ἐπὶ τὸ χεῖρον ἀναφορὰν ἔχει ἐνδέουσαν τοῦ αἴνου καὶ τὴν⟧ [ἔξωθεν ἐνδεχομένη μετάβασιν, οἷον "μένε] ⟦βοῦς ποτε βοτάνην" καὶ "κισσὸς μετ' ἀνθεστήρια⟧".

20T13 Eust. *Il.* Λ 430

[praecedunt Hes. 2T29c Archil. 4T35 Hes. 2T29d]
ἀπὸ δὲ φυτῶν, ὡς παρὰ Καλλιμάχῳ...
[sequitur Call. 20F2, fr. 194.6-7 δάφνην Pfeiffer (ἔν κοτε Πύλῳ)]
καὶ τὰ ἑξῆς. καὶ ἔστιν ὁ αἶνος ἐξηπλωμένη παροιμία.
[pergit Herenn. Ph. G27]

20T14 Eust. *Od.* ξ 508

[praecedunt Hes. 2T30c Archil. 4T36-37ab]
εἰς δὲ τὸ ἀπὸ φυτῶν συντελεῖ Καλλιμάχου τό,
[sequitur Call. 20F2, fr. 194.6 ἐν -7 ἐλαίην Pfeiffer (6 μάλῳ ἢ Δάλῳ τούτεστι Δήλῳ τῇ νήσῳ)]
καὶ ἑξῆς. καὶ ἔστι, φησίν, ὁ αἶνος ἡπλωμένη παροιμία, ἥ τις καὶ αὐτὴ ἀποκεφαλαιοῦται μὲν εἴς τινα παραίνεσιν, ἐκδέχεται δέ τι ἔξωθεν ἐπέκεινα τοῦ κειμένου. ὅτι δὲ καὶ γρίφῳ ἔοικεν ὁ τοιοῦτος αἶνος δῆλόν ἐστι. γριφεύεται γάρ πως ὁ αἰνισσόμενος. πρὸς διάφορον δὲ σημασίαν βαρύνεται ὁ τοιοῦτος αἶνος, πρὸς διαστολὴν δηλονότι τοῦ καθ' εὐθεῖαν ὀξυνομένου αἰνοῦ, ἀφ' οὗ ἐπαινὸς Περσεφόνεια. γίνεται γὰρ ὁ μὲν εὐλογητικὸς αἶνος παρὰ τὸ ἰαίνειν ὡς οἷον ἴαινος, ὁ δὲ ῥηθεὶς συμβολικὸς παρὰ τὸ αἰνόν. ὑποδύσκολος γάρ ἐστιν, ἢ καὶ παρὰ τὸ αἰανόν. σκοτεινὸς γὰρ λόγος ὁ τοιοῦτος αἶνός ἐστι καθὰ καὶ πᾶν αἴνιγμα. καὶ ἴσως διὰ τοῦτο Θηβαίου τὸν λόχον αἴγμα ἔλεγον, ὡς δηλοῖ Παλαίφατος ἐν τῷ περὶ Σφιγγός. βούλονται γὰρ οἱ λοχῶντες κρύπτεσθαι καὶ λανθάνειν, ὡς εἰ καὶ ὑπὸ σκότῳ αἰανῷ ἦσαν. φέρεται δὲ παρὰ τοῖς παλαιοῖς καὶ ὅτι Ἀθηνοκλῆς ἀθετεῖ ἐν τοῖς ῥηθεῖσι τὰ ἔπη, διότι ὁ αἶνος οὐκ ἔχει προσκειμένην καὶ τὴν ἀξίωσιν. καὶ ὅμως ἐγράφη τι ἀνωτέρω εἰς τοῦτο εὔλογον. ἡ γὰρ τῶν ἀκροατῶν ἀγροικία ἠνάγκασεν ἑρμηνευθῆναι τὸν αἶνον τῇ τῆς ἀξιώσεως ἐπιφορᾷ. καὶ οὕτω μὲν ταῦτα. οἷς προσθετέον καὶ ὅτι τετραχῶς παρὰ τοῖς παλαιοῖς ὁ αἶνος. ἔπαινος γάρ, φασί, γνώμη, παροιμία, καὶ πόλις, ἣν ῥαίκηλον ὁ Λυκόφρων καλεῖ.

20T15 Ps.-Ammon. *Diff.* 18 (p. 6 Nickau)

[= Call. 20T2 (Luc. Tarrh.)]

20T16 Apostol. *Praef.* 5

[praecedunt Archil. 4T45-46ab Hes. 2T41]
ἀπὸ δὲ φυτῶν· ὡς ἔχει τὸ τοῦ Καλλιμάχου·
[sequitur Call. 20F2, fr. 194.6-8 θέσθαι Pfeiffer]
Ἡ δὲ παροιμία τὴν ἀπὸ κεφαλαίου ἐπὶ τὸ χεῖρον ἀναφορὰν ἔχει, ἐνδέουσαν τοῦ αἴνου, καὶ τὴν ἔξωθεν ἐνδεχομένη ματάβασιν· οἷον μένε βοῦς ποτε βοτάνην [Apost. 11.11 (Arsen. 35.32)]· καὶ· ἄκισσος μετ' Ἀνθεστήρια [Apost. 2.4 (Arsen. 2.60)]. 6 Ἐτυμολογεῖται δὲ ὁ μὲν αἶνος

παρὰ τὸ ἰένω τὸ πέμπω καὶ διαχέω. ἰαίνεται γὰρ καὶ διαχέεται ἡ ψυχὴ τῇ διηγήσει τῶν τοιῶνδε λόγων· ἴαινος καὶ ἀφαιρέσει, αἶνος· ὁ τὴν διάνοιαν ἰαίνων καὶ περιτέρπων. Ὅμηρος· ἰαίνετο δὲ φρένας εἴσω [A.R. 3.1019].

20T17 Σ *in* Il. (*Cod. Reg.* 3058), sv αἶνος (III 371 Cramer)

[praecedunt Archil. 4T47-48ab Hes. 2T42]
ἀπὸ δὲ φυτῶν, ὡς ἔχει τὸ τοῦ Καλλιμάχου,
[sequitur Call. 20F2, fr. 194.6-8 Pfeiffer]
ἡ δὲ παροιμία τὴν ἀπὸ κεφαλαίου ἐπὶ τὸ χεῖρον ἀναφορὰν ἔχει, ἐνδέουσα τοῦ αἴνου, καὶ τὴν ἔξωθεν ἐνδεχομένη μετάβασιν. οἷον, "μένε βοῦς ποτὲ βοτάνην," καὶ "ἄκισσος μετ' ἀνθεστήρια." ἐτυμολογεῖται δὲ ὁ μὲν αἶνος παρὰ τὸ ἰαίνω τὸ πέμπω καὶ διαχέω· ἰαίνεται γὰρ καὶ διαχέεται ἡ ψυχὴ τῇ διηγήσει τῶν τοιῶνδε λόγων. ἴαινος, καὶ ἀφαιρέσει αἶνος, ὁ τὴν διάνοιαν ἰαίνων καὶ περιτέρπων· Ὅμηρος,
ἰαίνεται δὲ φρένας εἴσω [A.R. 3.1019].

20F1 Call. *Iamb.* 2 (fr. 192 Pfeiffer)

Ἦν κεῖνος οὑνιαυτός, ᾧ τό τε πτηνόν
καὶ τοὺν θαλάσσῃ καὶ τὸ τετράπουν αὔτως
ἐφθέγγεθ' ὡς ὁ πηλὸς ὁ Προμήθειος
. . . . . .
τἀπὶ Κρόνου τε καὶ ἔτι τὰ πρὸ τη[
λ..ουσα και κως [.]υ σ[.]νημεναισ.[
δίκαιος ὁ [Ζε]ύς, οὐ δίκαι[α] δ' αἰσυμνέων
τῶν ἑρπετῶν [μ]ὲν ἐξέκοψε τὸ φθέ[γμα,
γένος δὲ τ.υτ.[.].ρον -ὥσπερ οὐ κάρτ[ος
ἡμέων ἐχόντων χἠτέροις ἀπάρξασθαι-
...]ψ ἐς ἀνδρῶν· καὶ κ[υ]νὸς [μ]ὲ[ν] [Εὔ]δημος,
ὄ[νο]υ δὲ Φίλτων, ψιττακοῦ δε[
οἱ δὲ τραγῳδοὶ τῶν θάλασσαν οἰ[κεύντων
ἔχο[υ]σι φωνήν· οἱ δὲ πάντες [ἄνθρωποι
καὶ πουλύμυθοι καὶ λάλοι πεφ[ύκασιν
ἐκεῖθεν, ὠνδρόνικε·
ταῦτα δ' Α⌊ἴσω⌋πος
ὁ Σαρδιηνὸς εἶπεν, ὄντιν' οἱ Δελφοί
ᾄδοντα μῦθον οὐ καλῶς ἐδέξαντο.

20F2 Call. *Iamb.* 4 (fr. 194 Pfeiffer)

Ε⌊ἷς -ο⌋ὐ γάρ;- ἡ⌊μέ⌋ων, παῖ Χαριτά⌊δεω, καὶ σύ
.[....]ῳίκ[.].[....]—[
[ ]

παρ[.....].[
ἡ μὲν ..[.]ηνέκ[
ἄκου⌊ε⌋ δὴ τὸν αἶνον·
                                        ἔ⌊ν κοτε Τμώλῳ
δάφνην ἐλαίῃ νεῖ⌊κος οἱ πάλαι Λυδοί
λέγουσι θέσθαι καὶ γα[
καλόν τε δένδρε[ον
σείσασ[α] τοὺς ὅρπηκ[ας
ο.[..]συμη.ηφη[
.]...[.].ε..[.]ελουσιν[
* . . . .
†ἐγὼ φαύλη πάντων τῶν δένδρων εἰμί†
. . . .
]..[
τάλαινα[
ἐμεῦ πα[
τῇ δ' αὖτι[ς
'ὤφρων ἐ[λαίη
ἐγὼ δεμ.[
ὁ Δῆλον ο[ἰκέων]
καί μευ τ[
. . . .
ὡριστερὸς μὲν λευκὸς ὡς ὕδρου γαστήρ,
ὁ δ' ἡλιοπλὴξ ὃς τὰ [π]ολλὰ γυμνοῦται.
τίς δ' οἶκος οὗπερ [ο]ὐκ ἐγὼ παρὰ φλιῇ;
τίς δ' οὔ με μάντις ἢ τίς οὐ θύτης ἕλκει;
καὶ Πυθίη γὰρ ἐν δάφνῃ μὲν ἵδρυται,
δάφνην δ' ἀείδει καὶ δάφνην ὑπέστρωται.
ὤφρων ἐλαίη, τοὺς δὲ παῖδας οὑ Βράγχος
τοὺς τῶν Ἰώνων, οἷς ὁ Φοῖβος ὠ[ργίσθη,
δάφνῃ τε κρούων κἦπος οὐ τομ[ὸν λαοῖ]ς
δὶς ἢ τρὶς ε[ἰ]πὼν ἀρτεμέας ἐποίη[σε;
κ]ἠγὼ μὲν ἢ 'πὶ δαῖτας ἢ 'ς χορὸν φ[οι]τέω
τὸν Πυθαιστήν· γίνομαι δὲ κἄεθλον·
οἱ Δωριῆς δὲ Τεμπόθεν με τέμνουσιν
ὀρέων ἀπ' ἄκρων καὶ φέρουσιν ἐς Δελφούς,
ἐπὴν τὰ τὠπόλλωνος ἵρ' ἀγινῆται.
ὤφρων ἐλαίη, πῆμα δ' οὐχὶ γινώσκω
οὐδ' οἶδ' ὀκ[οίη]ν οὐλαφηφόρος κάμπτει,
ἁ[γν]ὴ γάρ εἰμι, κοὐ πατεῦσί μ' ἄνθρωποι,

ἱρὴ γάρ εἰμι· σοὶ δὲ χὠπότ' ἂν νεκρόν
μέλλωσι καίειν ἢ [τά]φ[ῳ] περιστέλλει[ν,
αὐτοί τ' ἀνεστέψ[αντο χ]ὐπὸ τὰ πλευρά
τοῦ μὴ πνέοντ[ος...]παξ ὑπ[έ]στ[ρωσαν.'
ἡ μὲν τάδ', οὐκέτ' ἄλλα· τὴν δ' ἀπήλ[λαξε
μάλ' ἀτρεμαίως ἡ τεκοῦσα τὸ χρῖμ[α·
'ὦ πάντα καλή, τῶν ἐμῶν τὸ κ[άλλιστον
ἐν τῇ τελευτῇ κύκνος [ὡς Ἀπόλλωνος
ᾔεισας· οὕτω μὴ κάμοιμ[ι ποιεῦσα.
ἐγὼ μὲν ἄνδρας, οὓς Ἄρη[ς ἀπόλλυσι,
συνέκ τε πέμπω χὐ[πὸ
..].ων ἀριστέων, οἵ κα.......[...].[..].
ἐγὼ] δὲ λευκὴν ἡνίκ' ἐς τάφον Τηθύν
φέρο[υσι] παῖδες ἢ γέροντα Τιθωνόν,
αὐτή [θ' ὁ]μαρτέω κἠπὶ τὴν ὁδὸν κεῖμαι·
γηθέω δὲ πλεῖον ἢ σὺ τοῖς ἀγινεῦσιν
ἐκ τῶν σε Τεμπέων. ἀλλ ἐπεὶ γὰρ ἐμνήσθης
καὶ τοῦτο· κῶς ἄεθλον οὐκ ἐγὼ κρέσσων
σεῦ; καὶ γὰρ ὡγὼν οὑν Ὀλυμπίῃ μέζων
ἢ 'ν τοῖσι Δελφοῖς· ἀλλ' ἄριστον ἡ σωπή.
ἐγὼ μὲν οὔτε χρηστὸν οὔτε σε γρύζω
ἀπηνὲς οὐδέν· ἀλλά μοι δύ' ὄρνιθες
ἐν τοῖσι φύλλοις ταῦτα τινθυρίζουσαι
πάλαι κάθηνται· κωτίλον δὲ τὸ ζεῦγος.
τίς δ' εὗρε δάφνην; γῆ τε καὶ κα[...]ς[
ὡς πρῖνον, ὡς δρῦν, ὡς κύπειρον, ὡς πεύκην.
τίς δ' εὗρ' ἐλαίην; Παλλάς, ἦμος [ἤρ]ιζ[ε
τῷ φυκιοίκῳ κἠδίκαζεν ἀρχαίοις
ἀνὴρ ὄφις τὰ νέρθεν ἀμφὶ τῆς Ἀκτῆς.
ἓν ἡ δάφνη πέπτωκε. τῶν δ' ἀειζώων
τίς τὴν ἐλαίην, τίς δὲ [τ]ὴν δάφνην τιμᾷ;
δάφνην Ἀπόλλων, ἡ δὲ Παλλὰς ἣν εὗρε.
ξυνὸν τόδ' αὐταῖς, θεοὺς γὰρ οὐ διακρίνω.
τί τῆς δάφνης ὁ καρπός; ἐς τί χρήσομαι;
μήτ' ἔσθε μήτε πῖνε μήτ' ἐπιχρίσῃ.
ὁ τῆς δ' ἐλαίης ἓν μὲν †αλιτιτωτ† μάσταξ
ὃ στ[έμφυλο]ν καλεῦσιν, ἓν δὲ τὸ χρῖμα,
ἓν [δ' ἡ κολ]υμβὰς ἣν ἔπωνε χὠ Θησεύς·
τ[ὸ δ]εύ[τερ]ον τίθημι τῇ δάφνῃ πτῶμα.
τεῦ γὰρ [τὸ] φύλλον οἱ ἱκέται προτείνουσι;

τὸ τῆς ἐλαίης· τὰ τρί' ἡ δάφνη κεῖται.
(φεῦ τῶν ἀτρύτων, οἷα κωτιλίζουσι·
λαιδρὴ κορώνη, κῶς τὸ χεῖλος οὐκ ἀλγεῖς;)
τεῦ γ]ὰρ τὸ πρέμνον Δήλιοι φυλάσσουσι;
τὸ τ]ῆς ἐλαίης ἣ ἀν[έπαυσ]ε τὴν Λητώ.
.....]οι πολῖται κ[ ]τι τῷ δήμῳ
]·τανουν ἐστεφέν μἄιν ἡ δάφνη
]α θαλλῷ καλλίνικος ἡλαίη
]υφανητε κὴπὶ τὴν ὄγχνην
]·τερην τιν' αἰνεῖται
]·ικουτεκοι μάντεις
]ν οὔτ' ἐπὶ φλιῆς
]·[φ]ημι τὴν δάφνην.'
ὣς εἶπε· τῇ δ' ὁ θυμὸς ἀμφὶ τῇ ῥήσει
ἤλγησε, μέζων δ' ἢ τὸ πρόσθεν ἠγέ[ρ]θη
τ]ὰ δεύτερ' ἐς τὸ νεῖκος, ἔστε τιν.[
βάτος τὸ τρηχὺ τειχέων π...δ.[.]υα
ἔλεξεν (ἦν γὰρ οὐκ ἄπωθε τῶν δενδρέων)·
'οὐκ ὦ τάλαιναι παυσόμεσθα, μὴ χαρταί
γενώμεθ' ἐχθροῖς, μηδ' ἐροῦμεν ἀλλήλας
ἄνολβ' ἀναιδέως, ἀλλὰ ταῦτά γ' .β..μ.;'
τὴν δ' ἆρ' ὑποδρὰξ ταῦρος ἡ δάφνη
ἔβλεψε καὶ τάδ' εἶπεν· 'ὦ κακὴ λώβη,
ὡς δὴ μί' ἡμέων καὶ σύ; μή με ποιήσαι
Ζεὺς τοῦτο· καὶ γὰρ γειτονεῦσ' ἀποπνίγεις
].ς οὐ μὰ Φοῖβον, οὐ μὰ δέσποιναν,
τῇ κ]ύμβαλοι ψοθεῦσιν, οὐ μὰ Πακτ[ωλόν
. . . .
]ας ἀλλήλους
]δρήστης
].ἕστηκεν
]ἥδιστος·
πε]ποιήσθω·
]μη χείρων
]ολπηι·
. . . .].
.ηρ.[ ].
τοδ.[ ]ν·
ἔχει[ ]

21. *Theocritus*

21T1 Gal. *Simp. med. temp.* 11.37 (12.360-361 Kühn)

[praecedit Ar. 17T11]

τοῦτο δέ φασι καὶ τὸν Θεόκριτον αἰνίττεσθαι λέγοντα,

[sequitur Theoc. 21A1]

δηλοῦν γὰρ αὐτὸν τὰς τὸν τύμβον ἐπὶ τῆς κεφαλῆς ἐχούσας.

[pergit Ar. 17T11]

21T2a Σ *in* 7.23d

κορυδαλλίδες· αἱ ἐπὶ τύμβου διατρίβουσαι ἢ ἐπὶ τῶν κεφαλῶν ἔχουσαι τάφῳ παραπλήσιον.

21T2b ibid. f

αἱ δ' ἐπιτυμβίδιοι κορυδαλλίδες· κορυδαλλίδες ἐνταῦθα εἶδος ἑρπετοῦ· λέγονται δὲ ἐπιτυμβίδιοι, ὅτι τάφοις ὡς ἐπιπολὺ ἐνδιατρίβουσιν. εἰ δὲ κορυδαλλίδας τὰ στρουθία νοήσεις, κορυδαλλίδες μὲν λέγονται διὰ τὸ κόρυσιν ἐοικέναι τὸ ἐπὶ τῆς κεφαλῆς αὐτῶν ἀνάστημα, ἐπιτυμβίδιοι δέ, ὅτι ὡσεὶ τύμβον τὸ τοιοῦτον ἀνάστημα ἐπὶ κεφαλῆς ἔχουσι. φέρεται δὲ ἐπὶ τούτων καὶ ἱστορία τοιαύτη· ὅτι

πρὸ τοῦ γενέσθαι τὴν γῆν γεγόνασιν αὗται· συνέβη γοῦν ποτε αὐτῶν τὸν πρόγονον ἀποθανεῖν, καὶ γῆς μὴ οὔσης ἐτάφη ὑπὲρ τῆς κορυφῆς τοῦ ἰδίου γόνου·

διὸ καὶ ἐπιτυμβίδιοι ἐπεκλήθησαν.

21A1 Theoc. 7.23 ?

"Σιμιχίδα, πᾷ δὴ τὺ μεσαμέριον πόδας ἕλκεις,
ἀνίκα δὴ καὶ σαῦρος ἐν αἱμασιαῖσι καθεύδει,
23 οὐδ'
ἐπιτυμβίδιοι κορυδαλλίδες
ἠλαίνοντι;
(...)"

22. *Cercidas*

22T1 Stob. 4.16.7

Κερκίδα Μελιάμβων.

[sequitur Cerc. 22A1]

22A1 Cerc. fr. 7 Lomiento

fr. 2
col. V Δοιά τις ἆμιν ἔφα γνάθοισι φυσῆν
τὸν κυανοπτέρυγον παῖδ' Ἀφροδίτας,
Δαμόνομ'· οὔτι γ[ὰ]ρ εἶ λίαν ἀπευθής.
καὶ βροτῶν [ὅτῳ] γὰρ ἂν πραεῖα καὶ εὐμενέ[ουσα]
δεξιτερὰ πνεύσῃ σιαγών,
οὗτος ἐν ἀτρεμίᾳ τὰν ναῦν Ἔρωτος
σώφρονι πηδαλίῳ Πειθοῦς κυβερνῇ·
τοῖς δὲ τὰν ἀριστερὰν λύσας ἐπόρσῃ
λαίλαπας ἢ λαμυρὰς πόθων ἀέλλας,
κυματίας διόλου τούτοις ὁ πορθμός.
εὖ λέγων Εὐριπίδας· οὐκοῦν κάρρον ἐστί
δύ' ὄντων ἐκλέγειν τὸν οὔριον ἀμὶν ἀήταν,
καὶ μετὰ σωφροσύνας οἴακι Πειθοῦς
χρώμενον εὐθυπλοεῖν ὄκ' ἦ κατὰ Κύπριν ὁ πορθμός;
μὴ[|

col. VI . . . .
(desunt ll. non minus V)
νομ[
δαπ[
καιτ[. . . . .] . ηξεῖ . [
στρα . [. . . .] .[. .]ρ πλόος· πάνν[
τὸ βιαι[οπόν]ηρον
καὶ προκοθ[η]λυμαν[ὲς] φέρει ταναβλαψιτέλειαν
καὶ μεταμελλοδύναν. ἁ δ' ἐξ ἀγορᾶς Ἀφροδίτα,
καὶ τὸ μη[δε]νὸς μέλειν, ὁπ[α]νίκα λῇς, ὅκα χρήζῃς,
οὐ φόβος, οὐ ταραχά· τα[ύ]ταν ὀβολῷ κατακλίνας
Τ[υν]δαρέοιο δόκει γαμβρ[ὸς τό]τ' ἦμεν.
νυ
γα[
γα[
ρε

[praecedit Cerc. 22A1]
fr. 7 . . . .
]ες[
τὸ τᾶς ⌊ῥικνᾶς χελώνας μναμόν⌋ευε·
οἶκος ⌊γὰρ ἄριστος ἀλαθέως⌋ καὶ φίλος

23. *[Aeschylus]*

23T1 Ar. *Ra.* 1431-1432
[vide Ar. 17A6]

23A1 [A.], *AP* 10.110
[vide A. 12T2 (Ar.)]

24. *Sophocles*

24T1 Hieronym. Rhod. fr. 35 Wehrli
[vide S. 24T2]

24T2 Ath. 13.82, 604D-F
καὶ Ἱερώνυμος δ' ὁ Ῥόδιος ἐν τοῖς Ἱστορικοῖς Ὑπομνήμασίν φησιν ὅτι Σοφοκλῆς εὐπρεπῆ παῖδα ἔξω τείχους ἀπήγαγε χρησόμενος αὐτῷ. ὁ μὲν οὖν παῖς τὸ ἴδιον ἱμάτιον ἐπὶ τῇ πόᾳ ὑπέστρωσεν, τὴν δὲ τοῦ Σοφοκλέους χλανίδα περιεβάλοντο. μετ' οὖν τὴν ὁμιλίαν ὁ παῖς ἁρπάσας τὸ τοῦ Σοφοκλέους χλανίδιον ᾤχετο, καταλιπὼν τῷ Σοφοκλεῖ τὸ παιδικὸν ἱμάτιον. οἷα δὲ εἰκὸς διαλαληθέντος τοῦ συμβεβηκότος Εὐριπίδης πυθόμενος καὶ ἐπιτωθάζων τὸ γεγονὸς καὶ αὐτός ποτε ἔφη τούτῳ κεχρῆσθαι τῷ παιδί, ἀλλὰ μηδὲν προσθεῖναι, τὸν δὲ Σοφοκλέα διὰ τὴν ἀκολασίαν καταφρονηθῆναι. καὶ ὁ Σοφοκλῆς ἀκούσας ἐποίησεν εἰς αὐτὸν τὸ τοιοῦτον ἐπίγραμμα, χρησάμενος τῷ περὶ τοῦ Ἡλίου καὶ Βορέου λόγῳ, καί τι μοιχείαν αὐτοῦ παραινιττόμενος·
[sequitur S. 24A1]

24A1 S. fr. 4 West
[praecedit S. 24T2]
Ἥλιος ἦν, οὐ παῖς, Εὐριπίδη, ὅς με χλιαίνων
γυμνὸν ἐποίησεν· σοὶ δὲ φιλοῦντι †ἑταίραν [West in app. crit.: "fort. τάλαν"]
Βορρᾶς ὡμίλησε. σὺ δ' οὐ σοφός, ὃς τὸν Ἔρωτα
ἀλλοτρίαν σπείρων λωποδύτην ἀπάγεις.

25. *Socrates*

25T1 D.L. 2.5 (42)
ἐποίησε [sc. Σωκράτης] δὲ καὶ μῦθον Αἰσώπειον οὐ πάνυ ἐπιτετευγμένως, οὗ ἡ ἀρχή·
[sequitur Socr. 25F1]

25T2 ***AP* 4.16**
Σωκράτους· (?)
[sequitur Socr. 25F1]

25T3 ***Suda*, σ 829 Adler**
καὶ ἐπὶ μὲν τῶν Πελοποννησιακῶν γέγονεν [sc. Σωκράτης], ὡς τύπῳ εἰπεῖν, ὀλυμπιάδι οζ', ἐβίω δὲ ἔτη π', εἶτα ἀλογίᾳ, μᾶλλον δὲ ἀπονοίᾳ τῶν Ἀθηναίων βιασθεὶς πιεῖν κώνειον ἀπέθανεν, ἔγγραφον οὐδὲν καταλιπὼν ἤ, ὥς τινες βούλονται, ὕμνον εἰς Ἀπόλλωνα καὶ Ἄρτεμιν, καὶ μῦθον Αἰσώπειον δι' ἐπῶν.

25F1 **Socr. fr. [1] West**
[praecedunt Socr. 25T1-2]
Αἴσωπος ποτ' ἔλεξε Κορίνθιον ἄστυ νέμουσιν
μὴ κρίνειν ἀρετὴν λαοδίκῳ σοφίῃ.

26. *Leonidas*

26T1 ***lemm. ad AP* 9.99**
εἰς
τράγον καταβεβρωκότα ἄμπελον, πρὸς ὃν ἐκείνη ὅτι πάλιν ἡ ῥίζα ἀνήσει ἕτερον κλῆμα βοτρυφόρον, ἵνα σοι θυομένῳ σπείσῃ ἐπιβώμιος.

26F1 **Leon. 32 Gow-Page, *AP* 9.99**
Ἴξαλος εὐπώγων αἰγὸς πόσις ἔν ποθ' ἀλωῇ
οἴνης τοὺς ἁπαλοὺς πάντας ἔδαψε κλάδους.
τῷ δ' ἔπος ἐκ γαίης τόσον ἄπυε· "Κεῖρε, κάκιστε,
γναθμοῖς ἡμέτερον κλῆμα τὸ καρποφόρον·
ῥίζα γὰρ ἔμπεδος οὖσα πάλιν γλυκὺ νέκταρ ἀνήσει
ὅσσον ἐπισπεῖσαι σοί, τράγε, θυομένῳ."

27. *Antipater Sid.*

27T1a ***Suda*, α 687 Adler**
Ἀΐξας· ὁρμήσας.
[laudatur Antip. Sid. 27F1.3-4]

27T1b ib. ε 3246
Ἐσχαρίου πυρός· τοῦ ἐπὶ τῆς ἐσχάρας.
[laudatur Antip. Sid. 27F1.6]

27T1c ib. η 251
Ἠλιτοεργός· ὁ τοῦ ἔργου ἀποτυχών.
[laudatur Antip. Sid. 27F1.6 ὢς...ἠλιτοεργός]

27T1d ibid. 525
Ἤριπεν· εἰς τὴν ἔραν κατέπεσεν.
[laudatur Antip. Sid. 27F1.6 (λαῦρον)]

27T1e ib. κ 1654
κινυρομένη· ὀδυρομένη, θρηνοῦσα.
[laudatur Antip. Sid. 27F1.5-6 (κινυρομένων, λαῦρον)]

27T1f ib. τ 390
τετραέλικτος· πολυέλικτος.
[laudatur Antip. Sid. 27F1.4]

27T2a *Suda*, α 1510 Adler
Ἅμματα, δεσμά. ἐν Ἐπιγράμμασι· χρύσεος ἀψαύστοιο διέτμαγεν ἅμμα κορείας Ζεύς, διαδὺς Δανάας χαλκελάτους θαλάμους [Paul. Sil., *AP* 5.217.1-2]. καὶ αὖθις·
[sequitur Antip. Sid. 27F2.4]
καὶ Πισίδης [fr. 56] περὶ Χοσρόου· ἐπεὶ δὲ λοιπὸν ἐντὸς ἦν τῶν ἀμμάτων, δεσμοῦσιν αὐτὸν ἀσφαλεστέρᾳ δέσει.

27T2b ibid. 1828
Ἀνάγκη· ἐν Ἐπιγράμμασι·
[sequitur Antip. Sid. 27F2.23 ἴδ'-24]
καὶ παροιμία· ἀνάγκῃ οὐδὲ θεοὶ μάχονται. παρεγγυᾷ, ὅτι δεῖ τοῖς παροῦσιν ἀρκεῖσθαι. ὅμοιον τῷ· ἂν μὴ παρῇ κρέα, ταρίχῳ στερκτέον.

27T2c ibid. 4172
Ἀσκητός· μετ' ἐπιμελείας κεκοσμημένος.
[sequitur Antip. Sid. 27F2.3]

27T2d ib. ε 747
Ἐλαστρηθείς· βιασθείς, κινηθείς.
[sequitur Antip. Sid. 27F2.6]

27T2e ib. κ 2544
Κοιλῶπις· βαθεῖα.
[sequitur Antip. Sid. 27F2.5]

27T2f ib. λ 869
Λυσσομανεῖς· ὑπὸ μανίας λελυσσηκότας.
[sequitur Antip. Sid. 27F2.2]

27T2g ib. σ 299
Σήκαθεν· ὡς εἰς σηκὸν κατεκλείσθησαν· τούτεστι μάνδραν. καὶ Σηκασθέντας, ὡς ἐν σηκῷ περικλεισθέντας. καὶ γὰρ ἐν κύκλῳ μὲν ὥσπερ σηκασθέντας ἐδεδίει, μὴ διὰ πλῆθος βιάσαιντο σφᾶς, ἐς ἓν τὸ ἀσθενέστατον τῆς κυκλώσεως ἐντείναντες. καὶ αὖθις·
[sequitur Antip. Sid. 27F2.1]

27T2h ibid. 1723
Σφεδανῶν· στερρῶν, ἰσχυρῶν.
[sequitur Antip. Sid. 27F2.11 ὄμμα-12]

27T3 *lemm. ad AP* 6.219
εἰς τὸ αὐτὸ Ἀντιπάτρου

27T4 *lemm. ad AP* 7.210
εἰς
χελιδόνα, ἥστινος τὰ τέκνα καταβέβρωκεν ὄφις.

27F1 Antip. Sid. 63 Gow-Page, *AP* 7.210

Ἄρτι νεηγενέων σε, χελιδονί, μητέρα τέκνων,
ἄρτι σε θάλπουσαν παῖδας ὑπὸ πτέρυγι,
αἴξας ἔντοσθε νεοσσοκόμοιο καλιῆς
νόσφισεν ὠδίνων τετραέλικτος ὄφις·
καὶ σὲ κινυρομέναν ὁπότ' ἀθρόος ἦλθε δαΐζων,
ἤριπεν ἐσχαρίου λάβρον ἐπ' ἄσθμα πυρός.
ὣς θάνεν ἠλιτοεργός· ἴδ', ὡς Ἥφαιστος ἀμύντωρ
τὰν ἀπ' Ἐριχθονίου παιδὸς ἔσωσε γονάν.

27F2 Antip. Sid. 64 Gow-Page, *AP* 6.219

Ἔκ ποτέ τις φρικτοῖο θεᾶς σεσοβημένος οἴστρῳ
ῥομβητοὺς δονέων λυσσομανεῖς πλοκάμους,
θηλυχίτων, ἀσκητὸς εὐσπείροισι κορύμβοις
ἁβρῷ τε στρεπτῶν ἅμματι κεκρυφάλων,

ἴθρις ἀνὴρ κοιλῶπιν ὀρειάδα δύσατο πέτραν
Ζανὸς ἐλαστρηθεὶς γυιοπαγεῖ νιφάδι.
τὸν δὲ μετ' ἀρρίγητος ἐπείσθορε ταυροφόνος θήρ
εἰς τὸν ἑὸν προμολὼν φωλεὸν ἑσπέριος·
ἀθρήσας δ' εἰς φῶτα καὶ εὐτρήτοισιν ἀυτμάν
μυκτῆρσιν βροτέας σαρκὸς ἐρυσσάμενος
ἔστα μὲν βριαροῖσιν ἐπ' ἴχνεσιν, ὄμμα δ' ἐλίξας
βρυχᾶτο σφεδανῶν ὄβριμον ἐκ γενύων.
ἀμφὶ δέ οἱ σμαράγει μὲν ἐναυλιστήριον ἄντρον,
ἄχει δ' ὑλάεις ἀγχινεφὴς σκόπελος.
αὐτὰρ ὃ θαμβήσας φθόγγον βαρύν, ἐκ μὲν ἅπαντα
ἐν στέρνοις ἐάγη θυμὸν ὀρινόμενον,
ἀλλ' ἔμπας ἐρίμυκον ἀπὸ στομάτων ὀλολυγάν
ἧκεν, ἐδίνησεν δ' εὐστροφάλιγγα κόμαν·
χειρὶ δ' ἀνασχόμενος μέγα τύμπανον ἐπλατάγησε,
δινωτὸν Ῥείας ὅπλον Ὀλυμπιάδος·
τὸν ζωᾶς ἐπαρωγόν· ἀήθεα γὰρ τότε βύρσης
ταυρείου κενεὸν δοῦπον ἔδεισε λέων
ἐκ δὲ φυγὼν ὤρουσεν. ἴδ' ὡς ἐδίδαξεν ἀνάγκα
πάνσοφος ἐξευρεῖν ἔκλυσιν Ἀίδεω.

28. *Carpyllides*

28T1 *lemm. ad AP* **9.52**

εἰς
ἁλιέα τινὰ ἀντὶ ἰχθύος κεφαλὴν ἀνθρώπειον ἀγρεύσαντα καὶ ἐν τῷ μέλλειν αὐτὸν ἐξορύττειν πρὸς τὸ θάψαι αὐτὴν ἐντυχόντα θησαυρῷ κεκρυμμένῳ.

28F1 Carpyllides 2 Gow-Page, ***AP*** **9.52**

Ἰχθῦς ἀγκίστρῳ τις ἀπ' ἠόνος εὔτριχι βάλλων
εἵλκυσε ναυαγοῦ κρᾶτα λιποτριχέα.
οἰκτίρας δὲ νέκυν τὸν ἀσώματον, ἐξ ἀσιδήρου
χειρὸς ἐπισκάπτων λιτὸν ἔχωσε τάφον·
εὗρε δὲ κευθόμενον χρυσοῦ κτέαρ. ἦ ῥα δικαίοις
ἀνδράσιν εὐσεβίης οὐκ ἀπόλωλε χάρις.

29. *Archias Mytilen.*

29T1 ***lemm. ad AP* 9.339**

εἰς

κόρακα καὶ σκορπίον, ὃν ὁ κόραξ μέλλων ἐσθίειν ὑπ' αὐτοῦ πληγεὶς ἀνῃρέθη.

29T2 Erasm. *Adag.* 1.1.68 (p. 50BC)

Cornix scorpium.

His confine est & illud, *Κορώνη τὸν σκορπίον,* *i.e.* Cornix scorpium, *subaudi, rapuit. Quadrat in hos, qui parant eos lædere, unde tantundem mali sint vicissim accepturi. Quemadmodum cornix correpto scorpio, arcuata illius cauda, vulnus accepit letale, periitque. Exstat super hac re Græcum epigramma Archiæ, quod non gravabor adscribere:*

[sequitur Arch. Mytil. 29F1 (1 μελάντερος, ναίων, 3 μάρψας)]

i.e. *Scorpius è terra prorepserat, idque vidente*
Corvo, qui cœlo victitat in liquido.
Corripuit visum, fugitque: sed hic ut humum ales
Contigerat, telo mox ferit atque necat.
Ecce tibi, quod in hunc avis insidiosa parabat,
Inde sibi accivit ipsa necem misera.

Atque id in rebus humanis frequenter usuvenire solet, ut qui cepisse videatur, ipse captus sit. Quemadmodum & Horatius:

Græcia capta ferum victorem cepit.

29F1 Arch. Mytil. 23 Gow-Page, *AP* 9.339

Ἔν ποτε παμφαίνοντι μέλαν πτερὸν αἰθέρι νωμῶν
σκορπίον ἐκ γαίης εἶδε θορόντα κόραξ,
ὃν μάρψων ὤρουσεν· ὁ δ' ἀίξαντος ἐπ' οὖδας
οὐ βραδὺς εὐκέντρῳ πέζαν ἔτυψε βέλει
καὶ ζωῆς μιν ἄμερσεν. ἴδ', ὡς, ὃν ἔτευχεν ἐπ' ἄλλῳ,
ἐκ κείνου τλήμων αὐτὸς ἔδεκτο μόρον.

30. *Archias Antioch.*

30T1 ***lemm. ad AP* 9.343**

εἰς

κόττυφον δίκτυον ὑπαλύξαντα.

30F1 Arch. Antioch. 24 Gow-Page, *AP* 9.343

Αὐταῖς σὺν κίχλαισιν ὑπὲρ φραγμοῖο διωχθεὶς
κόσσυφος ἠερίης κόλπον ἔδυ νεφέλης·

καὶ τὰς μὲν συνοχηδὸν ἀνέκδρομος ὤχμασε θῶμιγξ,
τὸν δὲ μόνον πλεκτῶν αὖθι μεθῆκε λίνων.
ἱρὸν ἀοιδοπόλων ἔτυμον γένος· ἦ ἄρα πολλὴν
καὶ κωφαὶ πτανῶν φροντίδ' ἔχουσι πάγαι.

31. *Herodotus*

31T1 Theon, *Prog.* 2 (Spengel II 65-66)
[praecedit Theon, G20b]
...παρὰ Ἡροδότῳ
τοῦ αὐλητοῦ [31F1],
[sequuntur Philist. 33T1 (q.v.), Theopomp. Hist. 35T1, X. 50T1].

31T2 Doxap. *Comm. in Aphth.* (II 147 Walz)
Ποιητῶν μὲν προῆλθε. ζητεῖται διὰ τί ἀπὸ τῶν ποιητῶν εἶπε προεληλυθέναι τὸν μῦθον· καί τοι καὶ συγγραφέων αὐτῷ χρησαμένων, οἷον Ἡροδότου ἐν πολλοῖς...
[sequitur Th. 32T2]

31T3 Σ *in* Aphth. (II 10 Walz)
Ποιητῶν· εἰ γὰρ καὶ Ἡρόδοτος καὶ ἄλλοι μύθοις ἐχρήσαντο, ἀλλὰ πρότεροι τούτων οἱ ποιηταί.

31F1 Hdt. 1.141.1-2
1 Ἴωνες δὲ καὶ Αἰολέες, ὡς οἱ Λυδοὶ τάχιστα κατεστράφατο ὑπὸ Περσέων, ἔπεμπον ἀγγέλους ἐς Σάρδις παρὰ Κῦρον, ἐθέλοντες ἐπὶ τοῖσι αὐτοῖσι εἶναι τοῖσι καὶ Κροίσῳ ἦσαν κατήκοοι. ὁ δὲ ἀκούσας αὐτῶν τὰ προΐσχοντο ἔλεξέ σφι λόγον,

ἄνδρα φὰς αὐλητὴν ἰδόντα ἰχθῦς ἐν τῇ θαλάσσῃ αὐλέειν, δοκέοντά σφεας ἐξελεύσεσθαι ἐς γῆν· 2 ὡς δὲ ψευσθῆναι τῆς ἐλπίδος, λαβεῖν ἀμφίβληστρον καὶ περιβαλεῖν τε πλῆθος πολλὸν τῶν ἰχθύων καὶ ἐξειρύσαι, ἰδόντα δὲ παλλομένους εἰπεῖν ἄρα αὐτὸν πρὸς τοὺς ἰχθῦς· Παύεσθέ μοι ὀρχεόμενοι, ἐπεὶ οὐδ' ἐμέο αὐλέοντος ἠθέλετε ἐκβαίνειν ὀρχεόμενοι.

3 Κῦρος μὲν τοῦτον τὸν λόγον τοῖσι Ἴωσι καὶ τοῖσι Αἰολεῦσι τῶνδε εἵνεκα ἔλεξε, ὅτι δὴ οἱ Ἴωνες πρότερον αὐτοῦ Κύρου δεηθέντος δι' ἀγγέλων ἀπίστασθαί σφεας ἀπὸ Κροίσου οὐκ ἐπείθοντο, τότε δὲ κατεργασμένων τῶν πρηγμάτων ἦσαν ἕτοιμοι πείθεσθαι Κύρῳ. 4 ὁ μὲν δὴ ὀργῇ ἐχόμενος ἔλεγέ σφι τάδε, Ἴωνες δὲ ὡς ἤκουσαν τούτων ἀνενειχθέντων ἐς τὰς πόλιας, τείχεά τε περιεβάλοντο ἕκαστοι καὶ συνελέγοντο ἐς Πανιώνιον οἱ ἄλλοι πλὴν Μιλησίων· πρὸς μούνους γὰρ τούτους ὅρκιον Κῦρος ἐποιήσατο ἐπ' οἷσί περ ὁ Λυδός· τοῖσι δὲ λοιποῖσι Ἴωσι

ἔδοξε κοινῷ λόγῳ πέμπειν ἀγγέλους ἐς Σπάρτην δεησομένους σφισί τιμωρέειν.

32. *Thucydides*

32T1 Σ *in* Th. 4.92.2

οἷς ἂν ἄλλος ἐπίῃ· ἐκ τῶν Αἰσώπου μύθων, ἄλλος ἄλλον ἀγρεῦσαι θέλων τρέχει τις, ἄλλος δ' ἄλλον ἐκ κακοῦ σώζων.

32T2 Doxap. *Comm. in Aphth.* (II 147 Walz)

[praecedit Hdt. 31T2]

...καὶ Θουκυδίδου σπανίως, οἷον τῷ τῆς ἀηδόνος καί τινων ἄλλων·

καί φαμεν, ὅτι ἐπειδὴ πρὸς νέους διελέγετο, ἐκ ποιητικῶν μαθημάτων πρὸς τὴν ῥητορικὴν ἄρτι ἀπηντηκότας καὶ μηδέπω συγγραφεῦσιν ἐντετυχηκότας, ἀφ' ὧν ἠπίσταντο αὐτοί, ἀπ' ἐκείνων τὸν μῦθον ἔφη προελθεῖν.

33. *Philistus*

33T1 Theon, *Prog.* 2 (Spengel II 65-66)

[praecedit Hdt. 31T1]

..., καὶ παρὰ Φιλίστῳ

τοῦ ἵππου

καὶ τῶν ἐν ἑκατέρῳ ἐν τῇ πρώτῃ καὶ ἐν τῇ δευτέρᾳ,...

[sequuntur Theopomp. Hist. 35T1, X. 50T1]

33F1 *FGrHist*556F6

[= Philist. 33T1]

Jacoby *ad loc.*: "die ausgefallene Buchzahl [ἐν τῇ πρώτῃ] Herodots ist am rande nachgetragen und dann korrupt in den text gedrungen".

34. *Aristoteles*

34T1 Σ *in* Ar. *Av.* 471b

[praecedit Σ *in* Ar. G66a]

καὶ Ἀριστοτέλης ἐν τῇ Σαμίων πολιτείᾳ εἰπόντα φησὶν αὐτὸν [sc. Αἴσωπον]

μῦθον

ηὐδοκιμηκέναι. VΓLh

34T2 Tricl. *in* Ar. *Av.* 471b
[vide Arist. 34T1 (Σ)]

34F/A1 Arist. fr. 573 Rose
[= Arist. 34T1]

35. *Theopompus*

35T1 Theon, *Prog.* 2 (Spengel II 65-66)
[praecedunt Hdt. 31T1, Philist. 33T1]
..., καὶ ἐν τῇ εἰκοστῇ Θεοπόμπου τῶν Φιλιππικῶν
ὁ τοῦ πολέμου καὶ τῆς ὕβρεως,
ὃν ὁ Φίλιππος διεξέρχεται πρὸς τοὺς αὐτοκράτορας τῶν Χαλκιδέων,...
[sequitur X. 50T1]

35F1 *FGrHist*115F127
[= Theopomp. Hist. 35T1]

36. *Aristobulus*

36T1 Plu. *Dem.* 23.4-6 (ed. Jacoby)
εὐθὺς δ' ὁ Ἀλέξανδρος ἐξῄτει πέμπων τῶν δημαγωγῶν δέκα μέν, ὡς Ἰδομενεὺς (III) καὶ Δοῦρις (FGrHist76F39) εἰρήκασιν, ὀκτὼ δ', ὡς οἱ πλεῖστοι καὶ δοκιμώτατοι τῶν συγγραφέων, τούσδε· Δημοσθένην Πολύευκτον Ἐφιάλτην Λυκοῦργον Μοιροκλέα Δήμωνα Καλλισθένην Χαρίδημον. ὅτε καὶ
τὸν περὶ τῶν προβάτων λόγον ὁ Δημοσθένης ὡς τοῖς λύκοις τοὺς κύνας ἐξέδωκε
διηγησάμενος, αὐτὸν μὲν εἴκασε καὶ τοὺς σὺν αὐτῷ κυσὶν ὑπὲρ τοῦ δήμου μαχομένοις, Ἀλέξανδρον δὲ τὸν Μακέδονα μονόλυκον προσηγόρευσεν. ἔτι δ' "ὥσπερ" ἔφη "τοὺς ἐμπόρους ὁρῶμεν ὅταν ἐν τρυβλίῳ δεῖγμα περιφέρωσι, δι' ὀλίγων πυρῶν τοὺς πολλοὺς πιπράσκοντας, οὕτως ἐν ἡμῖν λανθάνετε πάντας αὐτοὺς συνεκδίδοντες." ταῦτα μὲν οὖν Ἀριστόβουλος ὁ Κασσανδρεὺς ἱστόρηκε.

36F1 Aristobul. *FGrHist*139F3
[= Aristobul. 36T1]

37. *Hieronymus Cardianus*

37T1 D.S. 19.25.5-6 ?

[vide D.S. 38F1]

38. *Diodorus Siculus*

38F1 D.S. 19.25.5-6

2 καταστρατοπεδεύσαντες δ' ἀλλήλων ἀπὸ σταδίων τριῶν ἐπὶ μὲν ἡμέρας τέσσαρας ἀκροβολιζόμενοι καὶ προνομεύοντες τὴν χώραν διετέλεσαν, πάντων σπανίζοντες, τῇ πέμπτῃ δ' Ἀντίγονος πρεσβευτὰς ἐξαπέστειλε πρός τε τοὺς σατράπας καὶ τοὺς Μακεδόνας, ἀξιῶν Εὐμενεῖ μὲν μὴ προσέχειν, ἑαυτῷ δὲ πιστεύειν· 3 συγχωρήσειν γὰρ ἔφη τοῖς μὲν σατράπαις ἔχειν τὰς ἰδίας σατραπείας, τῶν δὲ ἄλλων τοῖς μὲν χώραν πολλὴν δώσειν, τοὺς δὲ στρατεύεσθαι βουλομένους διανεμεῖν εἰς τὰς ἑκάστῳ καθηκούσας τάξεις. 4 τῶν δὲ Μακεδόνων οὐ προσεχόντων τοῖς λόγοις, ἀλλὰ καὶ προσαπειλούντων τοῖς πρεσβευταῖς Εὐμενὴς παρελθὼν ἐπῄνεσέν τε αὐτοὺς καὶ λόγον εἶπε τῶν παραδεδομένων μὲν καὶ παλαιῶν, οὐκ ἀνοίκειον δὲ τῆς περιστάσεως. 5 ἔφη γὰρ

ἐρασθέντα λέοντα παρθένου διαλεχθῆναι τῷ πατρὶ τῆς κόρης ὑπὲρ τοῦ γάμου, τὸν δὲ πατέρα λέγειν ὡς ἕτοιμος μέν ἐστιν αὐτῷ δοῦναι, δεδοικέναι δὲ τοὺς ὄνυχας καὶ τοὺς ὀδόντας, μήποτε γήμας καὶ παροξυνθεὶς διά τινα αἰτίαν προσενέγκηται τῇ παρθένῳ θηριωδῶς. 6 τοῦ δὲ λέοντος ἐξελόντος τούς τε ὄνυχας καὶ τοὺς ὀδόντας τὸν πατέρα, θεωρήσαντα πάντα δι' ὧν ἦν φοβερὸς ἀποβεβληκότα, τύπτοντα τῷ ξύλῳ ῥᾳδίως ἀποκτεῖναι.

τὸ παραπλήσιον οὖν ποιεῖν καὶ τὸν Ἀντίγονον· 7 μέχρι τούτου γὰρ ποιεῖσθαι τὰς ἐπαγγελίας ἕως ἂν τῆς δυνάμεως κυριεύσῃ καὶ κολάσῃ τηνικαῦτα τοὺς ἀφηγουμένους. ἐπισημαινομένου δὲ τοῦ πλήθους ὡς ὀρθῶς λέγοντος τότε μὲν ἔλυσε τὴν ἐκκλησίαν.

38F2 D.S. 33.7.6

5 ἦν δὲ οὗτος [sc. ὁ Ὑρίατθος] κατὰ τὰς ὁμιλίας εὔστοχος, ὡς ἂν ἐξ αὐτοδιδάκτου καὶ ἀδιαστρόφου φύσεως φέρων τοὺς λόγους. καὶ γὰρ τῶν τὴν Τύκκην οἰκούντων οὐδέποτε μενόντων ἐπὶ τῆς αὐτῆς αἱρέσεως, ἀλλ' ὁτὲ μὲν πρὸς Ῥωμαίους, ὁτὲ δὲ πρὸς αὐτὸν ἀφισταμένων, καὶ πολλάκις τοῦτο πραττόντων, αἶνόν τινα διελθὼν οὐκ ἀσόφως ἔσκωψεν ἅμα καὶ ἐπέπληξε τὸ τῆς κρίσεως αὐτῶν ἀβέβαιον. 6 ἔφη γάρ

τινα μέσον ἤδη τὴν ἡλικίαν ὄντα γῆμαι δύο γυναῖκας, καὶ τὴν μὲν νεωτέραν ἐξομοιοῦν ἑαυτῇ φιλοτιμουμένην τὸν ἄνδρα ἐκ τῆς κεφαλῆς τὰς πολιὰς ἐκτίλλειν αὐτοῦ, τὴν δὲ γραῦν τὰς μελαίνας, καὶ πέρας ὑπ' ἀμφοτέρων αὐτὸν ἐκτιλλόμενον ταχὺ γενέσθαι φαλακρόν.

τὸ παραπλήσιον δὲ καὶ τοῖς τὴν Τύκκην οἰκοῦσιν ἔσεσθαι· τῶν μὲν γὰρ Ῥωμαίων ἀποκτεινόντων τοὺς ἀλλοτρίως πρὸς αὐτοὺς ἔχοντας, τῶν δὲ Λυσιτανῶν ἀναιρούντων τοὺς αὐτῶν ἐχθρούς, ταχὺ τὴν πόλιν ἐρημωθήσεσθαι.

39. *Aristoteles*

39T1a anon. *in Rh.* 2.20, 1393b8 (p. 125 Rabe)

[vide Stesich. 7T5a]

39T1b ib. 1393b17

[praecedit Arist. 39T1a]
[vide Stesich. 7T5b]

39T2a ib. b23

[praecedunt Arist. 39T1ab]

δημαγωγὸς ἐν Σάμῳ καταναλώσας δημοσιακὰ πράγματα κατεκρίθη θανεῖν.

[sequitur Arist. 39T2b]

39T2b ib. b26

[praecedunt Arist. 39T1ab 39T2a]

κυνοραισταὶ λέγονται τὰ τζιμούρια ἢ αἱ λεγόμεναι ἀλογομυῖαι παρὰ τὸ ῥαίζειν καὶ κείρειν τοὺς κύνας.

τὸ μὲν οὖν εὑρεῖν πράγματα πάλαι γεγενημένα, ὡς λαβεῖν αὐτὰ εἰς παράδειγμα, δύσκολον, τὸ δὲ πλάττειν λόγους καὶ μύθους ῥᾷον. ποιεῖν δὲ δεῖ μύθους ὥσπερ καὶ παραβολάς· εἰ γὰρ δύναταί τις συνορᾶν τὰς ὁμοιότητας τῶν πραγμάτων, οἷον ὁ βασιλεὺς καὶ ὁ ποιμὴν ὁμοιότητά τινα ἔχουσι, εὐκόλως ἂν ποιήσῃ παραβολάς· ὅπερ, τοῦτο τὸ βλέπειν τὰς ὁμοιότητας, ἐν τῇ φιλοσοφίᾳ ἤγουν τῇ διαλεκτικῇ παρεδώκαμεν καὶ ἐκεῖθέν ἐστι ῥᾷον λαβεῖν αὐτάς. τὰ μὲν οὖν παραδείγματα τὰ διὰ τῶν λόγων ἤτοι τὰ ἐκ τῶν μύθων πλαττόμενα εὔκολόν ἐστι λαβεῖν, τὰ δὲ διὰ τῶν πραγμάτων, τὰ δὲ παραδείγματα τὰ ἐκ τῶν πραγμάτων λαμβανόμενα, τῶν δὲ γεγενημένων πάλαι, ἃ καὶ ἐξ ἱστορίας ἔχομεν, δύσκολόν ἐστι λαβεῖν· οὐ γάρ ἐστι δυνατὸν συναγαγεῖν τοιαῦτα πολλά· εἰ δὲ καὶ εὑρεθῶσι, χρήσιμά εἰσι πρὸς συμβουλήν. εἰ μὲν οὐκ ἔχομεν ἐνθυμήματα, χρηστέον τοῖς παραδείγμασιν ὡς ἀποδείξεσιν, εἰ δὲ ἔχομεν, δεῖ λαβεῖν τὰ παραδείγματα ὡς μαρτύρια ἐπιλογικὰ μετὰ τοῦ ἐνθυμήματος· τὸ γὰρ ἐπιλόγοις ὡς ἓν μέρος λόγου ληπτέον, ὡς μετὰ τὰ ἐνθυμήματα λεγομένοις· καὶ εἰ μὲν πρὸ τῶν ἐνθυμημάτων λέγομεν τὰ παραδείγματα, ἀνάγκη πολλὰ λέγειν τοιαῦτα, εἰ δὲ μετὰ τοῦ ἐνθυμήματος, ἀρκεῖ καὶ ἓν παράδειγμα ὡς μαρτύρια ληφθῆναι. εἴδη παραδειγμάτων εἰσὶ δύο, τό τε διὰ λόγων καὶ μύθων καὶ τὸ διὰ γεγενημένων πραγμάτων. καὶ πῶς αὐτοῖς χρηστέον, ἤτοι εἰ μὲν ἐνθυμήματα οὐκ ἔχομεν, χρηστέον αὐτοῖς ὡς

ἀποδείξεσιν, εἰ δὲ ἐνθυμήματα ἔχομεν, χρηστέον αὐτοῖς ὡς μαρτυρίαις. καὶ πότε, ἤτοι ἐν μὲν τοῖς δημηγορικοῖς λόγοις χρηστέον τοῖς διὰ τῶν λόγων καὶ τῶν μύθων παραδείγμασιν, ἐν δὲ τοῖς συμβουλευτικοῖς χρηστέον τοῖς διὰ τῶν γεγενημένων πραγμάτων παραδείγμασι· διὰ τοῦτο γὰρ καὶ ἀνωτέρω εἴρηκε...

[laudatur Arist. G5, 1394a5 ῥᾷον-8 προγεγονόσι].

39T3a Arist. Lat. *anon.*

[= Stesich. 7T7]

[sequitur Arist. 39T3b]

39T3b ibid.

[praecedit Arist. 39T3a]

Esopus autem in Samo perorans iudicante dimagogo de morte dixit

vulpem transeuntem fluvium incidere in lacunam, non potentem exire per multum tempus male pati et yrudines multas occupare ipsam; ericius autem errans, sicut vidit ipsam, miserans interrogabat si auferat ab ea yrudines, ipsa autem non dimittebat; interrogante ipso, quare, 'quoniam hec quidem,' dicere, 'utique ex me plene sunt et modicum attrahunt sanguinis, si has aufertis, alie venient<es> famelice haurient reliquum sanguinis.'

'Sic enim et nos, viri Samii, hic quidem nichil amplius ledet (dives enim est), si hunc interficietis, alii venient mendici, qui nos destruent omnia furantes.'

39T4a Arist. Lat. *Guil.*

[= Stesich. 7T8]

[sequitur Arist. 39T4b]

39T4b ibid.

[praecedit Arist. 39T4a]

Esopus autem in Samo populum alloquens, cum iudicaretur rector populi ad mortem, ait

vulpem transeuntem fluvium propulsam fuisse in lacunam, et, cum non posset exire, multo tempore affligebatur et musce canine multe herebant ei; ericius autem errans, ut vidit ipsam, misertus est interrogavitque si auferat ab ipsa muscas caninas, eum autem non permisit; querente autem propter quid, dixit: 'quia iste quidem iam de me plene sunt et modicum trahunt sanguinem, si autem has abstuleris, alie venientes famelice epotabunt mei reliquum sanguinem.'

'Ita et vos, viri Samii, iste quidem nichil amplius nocebit (dives enim est), si autem occideritis, alii venient pauperes, qui vos absorbebunt reliqua furantes.'

39F1 Arist. *Rh.* 2.20, 1393b8-22

[= Stesich. 7T1]

[sequitur Arist. 39F2]

39F2 Arist. *Rh.* 2.20, 1393b22-1394a1

[praecedit Arist. 39F1]

Αἴσωπος δὲ ἐν Σάμῳ δημηγορῶν κρινομένου δημαγωγοῦ περὶ θανάτου ἔφη

ἀλώπεκα διαβαίνουσαν ποταμὸν ἀπωσθῆναι εἰς φάραγγα, οὐ δυναμένην δὲ ἐκβῆναι πολὺν χρόνον κακοπαθεῖν καὶ κυνοραιστὰς πολλοὺς ἔχεσθαι αὐτῆς, ἐχῖνον δὲ πλανώμενον, ὡς εἶδεν αὐτήν, κατοικτείραντα ἐρωτᾶν εἰ ἀφέλοι αὐτῆς τοὺς κυνοραιστάς, τὴν δὲ οὐκ ἐᾶν· ἐρομένου δὲ διὰ τί, "ὅτι οὗτοι μὲν" φάναι "ἤδη μου πλήρεις εἰσὶ καὶ ὀλίγον ἕλκουσιν αἷμα, ἐὰν δὲ τούτους ἀφέλητε, ἕτεροι ἐλθόντες πεινῶντες ἐκπιοῦνταί μου τὸ λοιπὸν αἷμα."

"ἀτὰρ καὶ ὑμᾶς, ἄνδρες Σάμιοι, οὗτος μὲν οὐδὲν ἔτι βλάψει (πλούσιος γάρ ἐστιν), ἐὰν δὲ τοῦτον ἀποκτείνητε, ἕτεροι [1394ᵃ] ἥξουσι πένητες, οἳ ὑμᾶς ἀναλώσουσι τὰ λοιπὰ κλέπτοντες."

[pergit Arist. G5]

40. *Demosthenes*

40T1 Aristobul. *FGrHist*139F3

[vide Aristobul. 36F1]

40T2 Plu. *Dem.* 23.4-6

[= Aristobul. 36T1]

40T3 Ps.-Plu. *Mor.* 848AB

λέγειν δέ ποτε κωλυόμενος ὑπ' Ἀθηναίων ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ βραχὺ ἔφη βούλεσθαι πρὸς αὐτοὺς εἰπεῖν, τῶν δὲ σιωπησάντων

'νεανίας' εἶπε 'θέρους ὥρᾳ ἐμισθώσατο ἐξ ἄστεος ὄνον Μεγαράδε· μεσούσης δὲ τῆς ἡμέρας καὶ σφοδρῶς φλέγοντος τοῦ ἡλίου ἑκάτερος αὐτῶν ἐβούλετο ὑποδύεσθαι ὑπὸ τὴν σκιάν· εἶργον δ' ἀλλήλους, ὁ μὲν μεμισθωκέναι τὸν ὄνον οὐ τὴν [B] σκιὰν λέγων, ὁ δὲ μεμισθωμένος τὴν πᾶσαν ἔχειν ἐξουσίαν·'

καὶ ταῦτ' εἰπὼν ἀπῄει. τῶν δ' Ἀθηναίων ἐπισχόντων καὶ δεομένων πέρας ἐπιθεῖναι τῷ λόγῳ, 'εἶθ' ὑπὲρ μὲν ὄνου σκιᾶς' ἔφη 'βούλεσθε ἀκούειν, λέγοντος δὲ ὑπὲρ σπουδαίων πραγμάτων οὐ βούλεσθε;'

40T4 Zen. 6.28

Ὑπὲρ ὄνου σκιᾶς· μέμνηται ταύτης ἐν τῷ Ἐγχειριδίῳ Μένανδρος. Λέγουσι δὲ ὅτι Δημοσθένης ὁ ῥήτωρ ἀπολογούμενος ὑπέρ τινος κινδυνεύοντος, οὐκ ἀνεχομένων τῶν δικαστῶν, εἶπεν· Ἀκούσατε, ὦ ἄνδρες, διηγήματος τερπνοῦ·

Νεανίσκος ποτὲ ὄνον ἐμισθώσατο Ἀθήνηθεν Μεγαράδε· μεσημβρίας δὲ καταλαβούσης, καταλύσας τὸν γόμον, ὑπῆλθε τὴν σκιὰν τοῦ ὄνου. Ἐκβαλλόμενος δὲ ὑπὸ τοῦ ὀνηλάτου, πρὸς βίαν διεφέρετο, μεμισθῶσθαι καὶ τὴν σκιὰν λέγων· ἀντιλέγοντος δὲ τοῦ ὀνηλάτου καὶ φάσκοντος τὸν ὄνον μεμισθωκέναι, εἰς δικαστήριον εἰσῆλθον ἀμφότεροι.

Εἰπὼν δὲ ταῦτα ὁ Δημοσθένης κατέβαινεν ἐκ τοῦ βήματος. Ἀξιούντων δὲ τῶν δικαστῶν τῆς δίκης τὸ τέλος μαθεῖν, εἶπεν ἀναβὰς πάλιν ἐπὶ τοῦ βήματος· Ὑπὲρ μὲν ὄνου σκιᾶς ἀκούειν, ὦ ἄνδρες, ἐπιθυμεῖτε· ἀνθρώπου δὲ κινδυνεύοντος ὑπὲρ ψυχῆς οὐδὲ τῆς φωνῆς ἀνέχεσθε;

Ἄλλοι δὲ λέγουσιν, ὅτι

Ἀθήνηθεν εἰς Δελφοὺς τὸν ὄνον ἐμισθώσατο.

Ὅθεν, φασί, καὶ αὐτὸς ὁ Δημοσθένης περὶ τῆς ἐν Δελφοῖς σκιᾶς φησί,...

[sequitur Pl. 49T2]

40T5 Σ *in* Luc. *Herm.* 71

παροιμία 'ὄνου σκία' ἐπὶ τῶν μηδενὸς ἀξίων. φασὶ δὲ εἱλκύσθαι τὴν παροιμίαν ἀπὸ τοῦ Δημοσθένει τῷ ῥήτορι συμβάντος. δίκην γάρ ποτε, ὥς φησιν Ἀριστείδης, ἀπολογούμενος, ἧς τὸ τίμημα ἦν, τί χρὴ παθεῖν ἢ ἀποτῖσαι, τοῦ κατηγόρου δεινῶς εἰρηκότος καὶ προσεξειργασμένου, διότι ⟨ὁ⟩ εὐθυνόμενος οὐδενὶ δικαίῳ, μόνῃ δὲ τῇ Δημοσθένους δεινότητι πέποιθεν, οἱ δικασταὶ μετεωρισθέντες οὐ προσεῖχον τῷ Δημοσθένει, ἀλλ' ἐθορύβουν κωλύοντες ἀπολογεῖσθαι. καὶ τούτου συμβαίνοντος ἐπὶ πλείονα χρόνον διαλιπόντων ποτὲ μικρὸν καὶ γενομένης βραχείας ἡσυχίας 'ἄνδρες' ἔφη 'δικασταί, μικρόν μου χρόνον ἀνάσχεσθε καὶ συγχωρήσατέ μοι λόγον οὐ πάλαι γεγονότα διηγήσασθαι'. τῶν δὲ συγχωρησάντων διὰ τὸ μὴ ὑπολαβεῖν τὸ ὑπ' αὐτοῦ μέλλον λέγεσθαι

'νεανίσκος τις' ἔφη 'τῶν ἐπὶ φιλολογίαν εἰς πόλιν ἡμῶν παραγεγονότων ὅτε ἀποτρέχειν ἔμελλεν, ἐμισθώσατο ὄνον πρὸς τὸ τὰ σκεύη διακομίσασθαι μέχρι Μεγαρέων. ὑπὸ κύνα δὲ τῆς ὥρας ὑπαρχούσης κατὰ τὸ μέσον τῆς ἡμέρας ἐκκαίοντος τοῦ ἡλίου θερμότερον οὔτε τὸ ὑποζύγιον συνέβαινε θέλειν ὁδοιπορεῖν οὔτε αὐτὸν ἀκολουθεῖν δύνασθαι. καταλύσαντος οὖν τὸ φορτίον τοῦ ὀνηλάτου καὶ τὸν ὄνον στήσαντος ἐκτὸς τῆς ὁδοῦ μὴ δυνάμενος ὑπομένειν τὸ καῦμα ἀλλὰ κακῶς διακείμενος ὑπὸ τὴν τοῦ ὄνου σκιὰν ὑποδὺς μένειν οἷός τε ἦν. τοῦ δὲ ὀνηλάτου ἐκεῖνον μὲν κωλύοντος, ἑαυτῷ δὲ ἐπιβάλλειν λέγοντος διὰ τὸ καὶ τὸν ὄνον ἴδιον εἶναι καὶ τὴν ἀπ' αὐτοῦ σκιὰν ὑπάρχειν ἰδίαν -μεμισθωκέναι γὰρ μόνον τὸν ὄνον διακομίσοντα αὐτοῦ τὰ σκεύη, οὐ μὴν τὴν σκιὰν αὐτοῦ-, ὡς δὲ καὶ ὁ νεανίσκος ἀντέλεγε πάλιν φάσκων τὴν ἡμέραν ὅλην αὐτοῦ τὸν ὄνον εἶναι καὶ πολλὴν ἀντιλογίαν γενέσθαι συνέβαινεν ἐκ τούτου, εἰς μάχην ὥρμησαν.'

ἐπεὶ δ' ὁ μὲν ταῦτα εἰπὼν κατέβαινεν ἀπὸ τοῦ βήματος, οἱ δὲ δικασταὶ κατεῖχον ἀξιοῦντες τὸ γενόμενον πέρας ἐξηγήσασθαι, ἐπιστραφεὶς 'ἄνδρες' εἶπεν, 'ὑπὲρ μὲν ὄνου σκιᾶς βούλεσθε ἀκοῦσαι, ὑπὲρ ἀνθρώπου δὲ κινδυνεύοντος τῷ βίῳ κωλύετε λέγειν;' οὕτω δὲ τοὺς δικαστὰς συγχωρήσαντας ὀρθῶς ὑπὸ τοῦ ῥήτορος ἐπιπεπλῆχθαι λέγειν ἐφεῖναι. ὅθεν τό τε τοῦ διηγήματος εὔστοχον καὶ τὸ τοῦ φρονήματος παρρησιαστικὸν διαμνημονευθὲν παροιμίας ἔλαβε τάξιν.

40T6 Σ *in* Pl. *Phdr.* 260c

περὶ ὄνου σκιᾶς] παροιμία ὄνου σκιᾶς· ἐπὶ τῶν μηδενὸς ἀξίων. φασὶ δὲ εἱλκύσθαι τὴν παροιμίαν ἀπὸ τοῦ Δημοσθένει τῷ ῥήτορι συμβάντος. δίκην γάρ ποτε, ὥς φησιν Ἀριστείδης, ἀπολογούμενος, ἧς τὸ τίμημα ἦν τί χρὴ παθεῖν ἢ ἀποτίσαι, τοῦ κατηγόρου δεινῶς εἰρηκότος καὶ προ[σ]εξειργασμένου διότι ⟨ὁ⟩ εὐθυνόμενος οὐδενὶ δικαίῳ μόνῃ δὲ τῇ Δημοσθένους δεινότητι πέποιθεν, οἱ δικασταὶ μετεωρισθέντες οὐ προσεῖχον τῷ Δημοσθένει, ἀλλ' ἐθορύβουν κωλύοντες ἀπολογεῖσθαι, καὶ τούτου συμβαίνοντος ἐπὶ πλείονα χρόνον, διαλειπόντων ποτὲ μικρὸν καὶ γενομένης βραχείας ἡσυχίας "ἄνδρες" ἔφη "δικασταί, μικρόν μου χρόνον ἀνάσχεσθε, καὶ συγχωρήσατέ μοι λόγον οὐ πάλαι γεγονότα διηγήσασθαι." τῶν δὲ συγχωρησάντων διὰ τὸ μέγα τι ὑπολαβεῖν τὸ ὑπ' αὐτοῦ μέλλον λέγεσθαι,

"νεανίσκος τις" ἔφη "τῶν ἐπὶ φιλολογίαν εἰς τὴν πόλιν ἡμῶν παραγεγονότων, ὅτε ἀποτρέχειν ἔμελλεν, ἐμισθώσατο ὄνον πρὸς τὸ τὰ σκεύη διακομίσασθαι μέχρι Μεγαρέων. ὑπὸ κύνα δὲ τῆς ὥρας ὑπαρχούσης, κατὰ τὸ μέσον τῆς ἡμέρας ἐκκαίοντος τοῦ ἡλίου σφοδρότερον, οὔτε τὸ ὑποζύγιον συνέβαινε ἐθέλειν ὁδοιπορεῖν οὔτε αὐτὸν ἀκολουθεῖν δύνασθαι. καταλύσαντος οὖν τὸ φορτίον τοῦ ὀνηλάτου, καὶ τὸν ὄνον στήσαντος ἐκτὸς τῆς ὁδοῦ, μὴ δύνασθαι ὑπομένειν τὸ καῦμα, ἀλλὰ κακῶς διακείμενος ὑπὸ τὴν τοῦ ὄνου σκιὰν ὑποδὺς μένειν οἷός τε ἦν. τοῦ δὲ ὀνηλάτου ἐκεῖνον μὲν κωλύοντος, ἑαυτῷ δὲ ἐπιβάλλειν λέγοντος διὰ τὸ καὶ τὸν ὄνον ἴδιον εἶναι καὶ τὴν ἀπ' αὐτοῦ σκιὰν ὑπάρχειν ἰδίαν· μεμισθωκέναι γὰρ μόνον τὸν ὄνον διακομίσοντα αὐτοῦ τὰ σκεύη, οὐ μὴν τὴν σκιὰν αὐτοῦ. ὡς δὲ καὶ ὁ νεανίσκος ἀντέλεγε πάλιν φάσκων τὴν ἡμέραν ὅλην αὐτοῦ τὸν ὄνον εἶναι, καὶ πολλὴν ἀντιλογίαν, συνέβαινεν ἐκ τούτου εἰς μάχην ὥρμησαν (l. ὁρμῆσαι)."

ἐπεὶ δ' ὁ μὲν ταῦτα εἰπὼν κατέβαινεν ἀπὸ τοῦ βήματος, οἱ δὲ δικασταὶ κατεῖχον ἀξιοῦντες τὸ γενόμενον πέρας ἐξηγήσασθαι, ἐπιστραφεὶς "ἄνδρες" εἶπεν, "ὑπὲρ μὲν ὄνου σκιᾶς βούλεσθε ἀκοῦσαι, ὑπὲρ ἀνθρώπου δὲ κινδυνεύοντος τῷ βίῳ κωλύετε λέγειν;" οὕτω δὲ τοὺς δικαστάς, συγχωρήσαντας ὀρθῶς ὑπὸ τοῦ ῥήτορος ἐπιπεπλῆχθαι, λέγειν ἐφεῖναι. ὅθεν τό τε τοῦ διηγήματος εὔστοχον καὶ τὸ τοῦ φρονήματος παρρησιαστικὸν διαμνημονευθὲν παροιμίας ἔλαβε τάξιν.

40T7 Isid. *Etym.* 1.40.7

[praecedit Isid. G75]

...et Demosthenes orator fabulam usus est adversus Philippum, qui cum ab Atheniensibus postularet ut sibi decem oratores darentur, et discederet, finxit ille [hanc] fabulam qua dissuaderet, dicens

lupos aliquando pastoribus, quorum diligentiam decipere voluissent, suasisse ut in amicitiam convenirent, ea tamen condicione, ut si canes, in quibus erat causa iurgiorum, iure illis traderentur: adnuisse pastores et in spem securitatis dedisse canes, quos ovium suarum vigilantissimos custodes habebant. Tunc lupi, adempta omni formidine, omne quod in gregibus illis erat, non pro satietate tantum, verum etiam pro libidine laceraverunt.

Philippum quoque principes populi postulare, quo facilius possit opprimere spoliatam custodibus urbem.

40T8 Phot. *Bibl.* 265, 495a15-44

Οὗτός [*sc.* ὁ Δημοσθένης] ποτε κωλυόμενος ὑπ' Ἀθηναίων ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ λέγειν βραχύ τι προσδιαλεχθῆναι αὐτοῖς ἔφη βούλεσθαι. Τῶν δὲ δεξαμένων·

"Νεανίας τις, ἔφησεν, ὥρᾳ θέρους ἐξ ἄστεος ὄνον ἐμισθώσατο Μέγαράδε. Τῆς δὲ φλογὸς κατὰ τὸ μέσον τῆς ἡμέρας ἐπὶ πλέον ἀναπτομένης, ἑκάτερος αὐτῶν ἔσπευδεν ὑπὸ τὴν ὄνου γενέσθαι σκιάν, ὁ μὲν λέγων μεμισθωκέναι τὸν ὄνον ἀλλ' οὐκ ἐν σκιᾷ, ὁ δὲ μεμισθωμένος, ἕως ἂν αὐτὸν κύριον τοῦ σώματος ἀποφαίνῃ τὸ μίσθωμα, καὶ τὴν ἄλλην ἔχειν ἐξουσίαν τῶν συμβαινόντων διὰ τοῦ σώματος."

Καὶ ταῦτ' εἰπὼν ἀπῄει, ὀργώσας αὐτῶν τὰς ἀκοὰς πρὸς τὴν λοιπῶν διήγησιν ἀπολιπών. Ἐπισχόντων δὲ αὐτὸν Ἀθηναίων καὶ πέρας ἐπιθεῖναι τῷ λόγῳ δεομένων, ὑπολαβών· "Εἶτα, ἔφη, ὑπὲρ μὲν ὄνου σκιᾶς βούλεσθε ἀκούειν, ὑπὲρ δὲ σπουδαίων πραγμάτων καὶ συμφερόντων τῇ πόλει οὐ βούλεσθε;"

40T9 Phot. *Lex.* *s.v.* ὄνου σκιά

[idem atque D. 40T10a (*Suda*)]

40T10a *Suda*, o 400 Adler

Ὄνου σκιὰ καὶ Περὶ ὄνου σκιᾶς· Σοφοκλῆς Κηδαλίωνι [fr. 331 Radt]· ὅ τι ἄν τι γίνηται, τὰ πάντ' ὄνου σκιά. Ἀριστοφάνης Δαιδάλῳ [fr. 199 *PCG*]· περὶ τοῦ γὰρ ὑμῖν ὁ πόλεμος νῦν ἐστι; περὶ ὄνου σκιᾶς. Ἀριστοτέλης ἐν Διδασκαλίαις [fr. 625 Rose] καὶ δράματός τινος φέρει ἐπιγραφὴν Ὄνου σκιάν. οἱ δὲ πρῶτον φθέγξασθαι τοῦτο Δημοσθένην, ἀπολογούμενον ὑπέρ τινος ἐπὶ μεγάλαις αἰτίαις κρινομένου, ὡς ἑώρα θορυβοῦντας τοὺς ἀκροωμένους. παρακαλέσας γὰρ αὐτοὺς μικρὰ προσέχειν ἤρξατο διηγεῖσθαι, ὡς

Μεγαράδε ἀπιὼν μισθώσαιτο ὄνον, καύματος δὲ ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ γενομένου, ὑπὸ τὴν σκιὰν τοῦ ὄνου βουληθείη ἀναπαύσασθαι, οὐ παρεῖναι γὰρ οὔτε δένδρον οὔτ' ἄλλο τοιοῦτον οὐδέν· τὸν δὲ ὀνηλάτην κωλύειν φάσκοντα, ὄνον αὐτῷ μεμισθωκέναι μόνον, οὐ μὴν καὶ σκιάν· ὥστε διατριβὴν αὐτοῖς καὶ φιλονεικίαν πολλὴν περὶ τούτου γενέσθαι.

ταῦτα δ' εἰπών, ὡς εἶδε τοὺς Ἀθηναίους προσέχοντας σφόδρα καὶ ἡδομένους καὶ ποθοῦντας τὰ ἑξῆς ἀκοῦσαι, ἐπέπληξεν αὐτοῖς, εἰ περὶ ὄνου μὲν σκιᾶς ἀκροᾶσθαι δέονται καὶ παρακαλοῦσιν, ὑπὲρ δὲ ἀνδρὸς περὶ τοῦ ζῆν κινδυνεύοντος οὐκ ἐθέλουσιν ἀκούειν. δῆλον δὲ ὅτι λεγομένῳ τούτῳ ἐχρήσατο Δημοσθένης. διόπερ καὶ ἐν τοῖς Φιλιππικοῖς [5.25] παρῳδῶν τὴν παροιμίαν φησὶ διαφέρεσθαι τοὺς Ἀθηναίους περὶ τῆς ἐν Δελφοῖς σκιᾶς.

40T10b ib. υ 327

Ὑπὲρ ὄνου σκιᾶς· ἐπὶ τῶν ὑπὲρ μηδενὸς χρησίμου φιλοτιμουμένων. λέγουσιν ὅτι Δημοσθένης ἀπολογούμενος ὑπέρ τινος κινδυνεύοντος οὐκ ἀνασχομένων τῶν δικαστῶν εἶπεν· ''Ακούσατε, ὦ ἄνδρες, διηγήματος τερπνοῦ·

Νεανίσκος ποτὲ Ἀθήνηθεν εἰς Δελφοὺς ὄνον ἐμισθώσατο· μεσημβρίας δὲ καταλαβούσης, καταλύσας τὸν γόμον ὑπέδυ τὴν σκιὰν τοῦ ὄνου· ἐκβαλλόμενος δὲ ὑπὸ τοῦ ὀνηλάτου μὴ καὶ τὴν σκιὰν μεμισθῶσθαι λέγοντος, εἰσῆλθον εἰς τὸ δικαστήριον ἀμφότεροι.

εἰπὼν ταῦτα ὁ Δημοσθένης κατέβαινεν ἐκ τοῦ βήματος· ἀξιούντων δὲ τῶν δικαστῶν τὸ τέλος τῆς δίκης μαθεῖν, εἶπεν ἀναβὰς πάλιν ἐπὶ τοῦ βήματος, ὑπὲρ μὲν ὄνου σκιᾶς ἀκούειν, ὦ ἄνδρες, ἐπιθυμεῖτε, ἀνθρώπου δὲ κινδυνεύοντος ὑπὲρ ψυχῆς οὐδὲ φωνῆς ἀνέχεσθε· τούτῳ καθαψάμενος τῶν κριτῶν τὸν κατηγορούμενον περιέσωσεν. τάττεται τοίνυν ἡ παροιμία ἐπὶ τῶν ὑπὲρ μηδενὸς χρησίμου φιλοτιμουμένων.

40T11 Apostol. 17.69

[idem atque D. 40T10b (*Suda*) (om. τάττεται...φιλοτιμουμένων)]

40T12 Arsen. 51.54

[idem atque D. 40T11 (Apostol.)]

40T13 Erasm. *Adag.* 1.3.52 (pp. 132-133)

De asini umbra.

Ὑπὲρ ὄνου σκιᾶς, *i.e.* Super asini umbra: *pro eo quod est, de re nihili. (...) Demosthenes in Philippica quadam,* Πρὸς ἅπαντας περὶ τῆς ἐν Δελφοῖς σκιᾶς νυνὶ πολεμῆσαι, *i.e.* Cum omnibus in præsentia de Delphica umbra digladiari. *Proinde sunt qui credant hoc adagii primum ab auctore Demosthene natum fuisse, fabulam hujusmodi referentes:*

Cum aliquando Demosthenes quendam in causa capitali defenderet, ac judices haberet parum attentos, sed dicenti obstreperent, ille, paulisper, *inquit,* aures mihi præbete, siquidem rem narrabo novam ac lepidam, atque auditu jucundam. Ad quæ verba cum illi jam aures arrexissent,

Adulescens, *inquit,* quispiam asinum conduxerat, rerum quiddam Athenis Megaram deportaturus. Inter viam autem cum æstus meridianus ingravesceret, nec inveniret quodam umbraculo solis ardorem defenderet, depositis clitellis, sub asino sedens, ejus umbra semet obtegebat. Cæterum id agaso non sinebat, hominem inde depellens, clamansque asinum esse locatum, non asini umbram. Alter item ex adverso tendebat, asseverans etiam umbram asini sibi conductam esse. Atque ita inter eos acerrima rixa in longum producta est, ita ut etiam ad manus venerint: hoc pertinaciter affirmante, non conductam esse asini umbram, illo pari contentione respondente, umbram etiam asini conductam esse. Demum in jus ambulant.

Hæc locutus Demosthenes, ubi sensisset judices diligenter auscultantes, repente cœpit a tribunalibus descendere. Porro revocatus a judicibus, rogatusque, ut reliquum fabulæ pergeret enarrare: de asini, inquit, umbra libet audire; viri causam de vita periclitantis audire gravamini? Paulo aliter narrat Plutarchus in vita Demosthenis, his quidem verbis:

[sequitur D. 40T3]

i.e. Cum in concione dicenti obstreperent Athenienses, ait se breviter illis velle narrare quiddam. At silentio facto;

Adolescens, inquit, æstatis tempore asinum mercede conduxerat, ut eo ab urbe Megaram proficiscens uteretur. Porro meridie cum sol acriter æstuaret, uterque cupiebat sub umbram asini succedere. Verum alter alterum arcebat, cum hic diceret asinum conductum esse, non umbram. Rursus alter qui conduxerat, se plenum habere jus responderet:

atque hæc locutus, discedere parabat. Retinentibus autem Atheniensibus, utque reliquam fabulæ partem adderet orantibus: Itane, inquit, de asini umbra audire cupitis, de rebus seriis loquentem auscultare non vultis?

Quidam ajunt, asinum Athenis, non Megaram, sed Delphos fuisse conductum, quod idem apparet ex verbis Demosthenis, qui Delphicam umbram nominat, in calce orationis De pace [5.25]*:*

Οὐκοῦν εὔηθες καὶ κομιδῇ σχέτλιον, πρὸς ἑκάστους καθ' ἕνα οὑτωσὶ ἤδη προσενηνεγμένους, περὶ τῶν οἰκείων, καὶ τῶν ἀναγκαιοτάτων, πρὸς ἅπαντας περὶ τῆς ἐν Δελφοῖς σκιᾶς νυνὶ πολεμῆσαι. *i.e.* An non igitur stultum ac vehementer miserum, singulos adversus singulos ita commissos de rebus propriis, ac maxime necessariis, cum universis de umbra Delphica nunc depugnare.

40T14 Melanchthon, *Util. fab.* (col. 119 Bretschneider)

[praecedunt Hom. 1T6 Hes. 2T43]

Dixi quo consilio putem repertas esse fabulas, potestque ex hoc velut fonte precium earum et utilitas aestimari. Neque enim tam prudentes viri fabularum autores his nugis unquam delectati fuissent, nisi ad erudiendas pueriles mentes, plurimum conducere sensissent. Quid, quod non modo pueris, sed celeberrimis etiam civitatibus fabulae salutares fuerunt. Cum plebs Romana patribus dissideret, secessumque est in sacrum montem, nec saeveriore ulla oratione flecteretur, missus est Agrippa, qui universam multitudinem lepido apologo, de ventre et reliquis hominis membris ita cepit, ut statim liberet in gratiam cum patribus redire.

Demosthenes gravis Orator, cum Macedo ea conditione cum Atheniensibus foedus fecturus esset, ut illi Oratores sibi dederent, qui perpetuis concionibus animos civium adversus se exacerbarent, iniquissimam conditionem Reipub. festivo quodam apologo dissuasit, quanquam ab ea non ita multum plebs diutino bello vexata abhorreret. Nam cum docere vellet in hoc postulari Oratores, ut urbs destituta Oratorum praesidio, regiae tyrannidi pateret, mira luce et perspicuitate, Macedonis consilium ante oculos multitudinis posuit hoc commento:

lupos quondam cum pastoribus pactos esse, nihil se posthac hostile caulis illaturos esse, si sibi canes dederentur. Placuit stultis pastoribus conditio, canesque dediti sunt. Proinde ubi lupi viderunt excubias caularum sublatas esse, libere grassari in gregem coepere.

Haec fabula cum docuisset quanti referret Oratores servari, Rempub. tantisper servavit, dum hoc consilium valuit. Miram quandam fabulae vim inesse, vel haec exempla testantur: necesse est enim efficacissimam orationem fuisse, quae implacabiliter iratis civibus Romanis arma e manibus extorsit, quae Athenienses graviter afflictos adduxit, ut quanquam una voce pacem omnes flagitassent, bellum tamen quam pacem mallent.

40F1 D. fr. 13 Baiter-Sauppe

[vide D. 40T2 (Plu.)]

40F2 ib. fr. 15

[vide D. 40T10b (*Suda*)]

41. *Demades*

41T1 *fab. aes.* 63 Hausrath

Δημάδης ὁ ῥήτωρ δημηγορῶν ποτε ἐν Ἀθήναις ἐκείνων μὴ πάνυ τι αὐτῷ προσεχόντων, ἐδεήθη αὐτῶν ὅπως ἐπιτρέψωσιν αὐτῷ Αἰσώπειον μῦθον εἰπεῖν. τῶν δὲ συγχωρησάντων αὐτῷ, ἀρξάμενος ἔλεγε·

[sequitur Demad. 41F1]

καὶ ταῦτα εἰπὼν ἐσιώπησεν. ἐρομένων δὲ αὐτῶν 'ἡ οὖν Δήμητρα τί ἔπαθεν;' ἔφη· 'κεχόλωται ὑμῖν, οἵτινες τὰ τῆς πόλεως πράγματα ἐάσαντες Αἰσώπειον μῦθον ἀκούειν ἀνέχεσθε'.

οὕτω καὶ τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἀλόγιστοί εἰσιν, ὅσοι τῶν μὲν ἀναγκαίων ὀλιγωροῦσι, τὰ δὲ πρὸς ἡδονὴν μᾶλλον αἱροῦνται.

41T2 Leonardo Dati 40 (pp. 298-299 Tacke)

Demas orator ad populum

Ad populum Demas olim cum oraret Athenis
—Ne foret intentis auribus ille sibi—
Orat, quisque uelit lepidam exaudire fabellam;
Sic mox attentis omnibus orsus ait:
Alaudam anguillamque simul comitatur hirundo;
Tres unam statiunt arripiuntque uiam.
Obiectum primo leuis ales, hirundo, fluentum
Transuolat, anguilla flumine mersa natat.
His dictis tacet orator. tunc murmur in illum
Fertur: et alaudae quid fuit? Ille refert:
Indignor uobis, cum surdi ad publica facta,
Ad fictas adeo conuigiletis aues.
Est homo mentis inops, qui non, quod amare necesse est,
Unde uoluptatem sentiat, illud amet.

41F1 Demad. fr. 22 De Falco

[praecedit Demad. 41T1]

'Δήμητρα καὶ χελιδὼν καὶ ἔγχελυς τὴν αὐτὴν ὁδὸν ἐβάδιζον· γενομένων δὲ αὐτῶν κατά τινα ποταμόν, ἡ μὲν χελιδὼν ἔπτη, ἡ δὲ ἔγχελυς κατέδυ'·

[pergit testimonium]

42. *Philodemus*

42A1a Phld. *Rh.* 2, fr. 3.11-12 (p. 68 Sudhaus)

Νὴ Δία τὰ [μὲν τεχ-
νικὰ παρ' ἄλλων ἔλ[αβον οἷόν
τινα ἐ[ρισ]τικὰ καὶ τ[ὰ τῶν
ἀμφιβ[ο̣λ]ιῶν ἐκ̣ τῆς δια[λεκτι-
κ[ῆ]ς καὶ
πτερ[οῖ]ς ἀλλ[οτρίοις ἐ-
κόσμησαν̣ [ἑαυτούς.

13-20 (sin. pag.) προσπεδα—αφησουσι—φασισ-αι—φασιν—βολιων (i. e. αμφιβολιῶν)—μαθουσα—πσσεχα—τεσ̣θα

[sequitur adlusio altera]

42A1b ibid.25-27

[praecedit adlusio altera]

λιναν [. . . . . ενωσοπερι τε .]ατον [παρὰ] ποι[ητικῆς παρ]αλ[αβὼν καὶ ῥητορικῆς καὶ γεω]μετ[ρίας καὶ ἀστρολογίας καὶ μουσικῆς ἀλλοτρίοις ἑαυτὸν π[τεροῖς κολοιοῦ τρόπον κε]κόσμ[ηκεν. Κατὰ γὰρ τὸν Εὐρ[ιπί]δη[ν ἐκ βαθείας αἰθέρος [λαβεῖν ἀμοχθεὶ πάρεστιν τ]ὰ π[οιοῦντα πίστεις, ὅταν [ἐθέλωμεν.

43. *Demetrius*

43A1 Demetr. *Eloc.* 157

[vide Arist. 57T1]

43A2 ib. 158

[vide auct. inc. 58T1]

44. *Alcmaeon Crotoniensis*

44T1 Isid. *Etym.* 1.40

[praecedit Isid. G75]

Has [sc. *fabulas*] *primus invenisse traditur Alcmeon Crotoniensis,...*

[pergit testimonium]

44T2 Rom. Vind. *Epil.* (II 454 Hervieux)

Quid conferant fabule.

Fabulas Poete a fando nominauerunt, quia non sunt res facte, sed tantum loquendo ficte, quia ideo sunt inducte, ut per ficta mutorum animalium inter se colloquia ymago quedam vite hominum monstraretur.

Has primus invenisse traditur Alcinon Cortoniensis.

Sunt autem fabule ysopice aut libistice. Ysopicae sunt, cum animalia muta inter se sermocinare videntur, uel que animam non habent, ut vrbes, arbores, montes, petre, flumina. Lybistice autem, cum hominum cum bestiis, aut bestiarum cum hominibus fingitur vocis esse conmercium. Fabulas Poete quasdam delectandi causa finxerunt, quasdam ad

naturam rerum, nonnullas ad mores hominum sunt interpretati. Delectandi causa fictas, ut eas quas uulgo dicunt, uel quales Plautus et Terencius conposuerunt. Ad naturas rerum fabulas fingunt, vt Vulcanus claudus, quia per naturam nunquam rectus est ignis; ut illa triformis bestia: prima Leo, postrema Draco, in medio Chimera [Lucr. 5.903], id est Capra, etates hominum per eam volentes distinguere, quarum prima ab adolescencia ferox et horrens ut Leo, dimidium tempus vite lucidissimum vt Capra, et quod acutissime videat; tunc fit senectus ut Draco; sicut et [H]ip[p]ocent(h)auri fabulam confictam, id est hominem Equo mixtum, ad exprimendam velocitatem humane vite, quia equum constat velocissimum esse. Ad mores, ut

apud Horatium, Mus loquitur Muri [S. 2.6.79-117] *et Mustela Vulpecule* [Ep. 1.7.29-33],

ut, per narracionem fictam, ad id quod agitur uera significacio referatur.

44T3 Conr. Hirs. *Dial. super Avian.* (p. 26 Huygens)

DISCIPULUS

...quem quis precesserit, an Hesopus Auianum an ille istum, ostende.

MAGISTER

Neuter horum primus inuentor est fabularum, sed

Alcimon Crotoniensis primum intexendis fabulis fertur laborasse; laborat enim omnis qui loquitur mendacium. quem secutus est Hesopus,

Hesopum Auianus, sed utrique prestantior utpote catholicus et in prosa uel metro optime eruditus.

45. *Antipho*

45T1a Stob. 3.16.30

Ἀντιφῶντος. ἔστι δέ τις λόγος, ὡς ἄρα

[sequitur Antipho Soph. 45F1]

45T1b Stob. 4.40.19

Ἀντιφῶντος.

[sequitur Antipho Soph. 45F1 ὅτῳ γὰρ ὁ θεὸς...ἀπεστέρησεν.]

45F1 Antipho Soph. 87B54 Diels-Kranz

[praecedunt Antipho Soph. 45T1a, 45T1b (sub fine)]

...ἰδὼν ἀνὴρ ἄνδρα ἕτερον ἀργύριον ἀναιρούμενον πολὺ ἐδεῖτό οἱ δανεῖσαι ἐπὶ τόκῳ· ὁ δ' οὐκ ἠθέλησεν, ἀλλ' ἦν οἷος ἀπιστεῖν τε καὶ μὴ ὠφελεῖν μηδένα, φέρων δ' ἀπέθετο ὅποι δή· καί τις καταμαθὼν τοῦτο ποιοῦντα ὑφείλετο· ὑστέρῳ δὲ χρόνῳ ἐλθὼν οὐχ εὕρισκε τὰ χρήματα ὁ καταθέμενος. περιαλγῶν οὖν τῇ συμφορᾷ τά τε ἄλλα καὶ ὅτι οὐκ ἔχρησε τῷ δεομένῳ, ὃ ἂν αὐτῷ καὶ σῷον ἦν καὶ ἕτερον προσέφερεν, ἀπαντήσας δὲ τῷ ἀνδρὶ τῷ τότε δανειζομένῳ ἀπωλοφύρετο τὴν συμφοράν, ὅτι ἐξήμαρτε καὶ ὅτι οἱ

μεταμέλει οὐ χαρισαμένῳ, ἀλλ' ἀχαριστήσαντι, ὡς πάντως οἱ ἀπολόμενον τὸ ἀργύριον. ὁ δ' αὐτὸν ἐκέλευε μὴ φροντίζειν, ἀλλὰ νομίζειν αὐτῷ εἶναι καὶ μὴ ἀπολωλέναι, καταθέμενον λίθον εἰς τὸ αὐτὸ χωρίον. "πάντως γὰρ οὐδ' ὅτε ἦν σοι, ἐχρῶ αὐτῷ, ὅθεν μηδὲ νῦν νόμιζε στέρεσθαι μηδενός."

ὅτῳ γάρ τις μὴ ἐχρήσατο μηδὲ χρήσεται, ὄντος ἢ μὴ ὄντος αὐτῷ οὐδὲν οὔτε πλέον οὔτε ἔλασσον βλάπτεται. ὅτῳ γὰρ ὁ θεὸς μὴ παντελῶς βούλεται ἀγαθὰ διδόναι ἀνδρί, χρημάτων πλοῦτον παρασχών, τοῦ καλῶς φρονεῖν ⟨δὲ⟩ πένητα ποιήσας, τὸ ἕτερον ἀφελόμενος ἀμφοτέρων ἀπεστέρησεν.

46. *Socrates*

46T1 Pl. *Phd.* 60c-61b

[praecedit Pl. 49F1]

Ὁ οὖν Κέβης ὑπολαβών, Νὴ τὸν Δία, ὦ Σώκρατες, ἔφη, εὖ γ' ἐποίησας ἀναμνήσας με. περὶ γάρ τοι τῶν ποιημάτων [d] ὧν πεποίηκας ἐντείνας τοὺς τοῦ Αἰσώπου λόγους καὶ τὸ εἰς τὸν Ἀπόλλω προοίμιον καὶ ἄλλοι τινές με ἤδη ἤροντο, ἀτὰρ καὶ Εὔηνος πρῴην, ὅτι ποτὲ διανοηθείς, ἐπειδὴ δεῦρο ἦλθες, ἐποίησας αὐτά, πρότερον οὐδὲν πώποτε ποιήσας. εἰ οὖν τί σοι μέλει τοῦ ἔχειν ἐμὲ Εὐήνῳ ἀποκρίνασθαι ὅταν με αὖθις ἐρωτᾷ -εὖ οἶδα γὰρ ὅτι ἐρήσεται- εἰπέ τί χρὴ λέγειν.

Λέγε τοίνυν, ἔφη, αὐτῷ, ὦ Κέβης, τἀληθῆ, ὅτι οὐκ ἐκείνῳ βουλόμενος οὐδὲ τοῖς ποιήμασιν αὐτοῦ ἀντίτεχνος [e] εἶναι ἐποίησα ταῦτα -ᾔδη γὰρ ὡς οὐ ῥᾴδιον εἴη- ἀλλ' ἐνυπνίων τινῶν ἀποπειρώμενος τί λέγει, καὶ ἀφοσιούμενος εἰ ἄρα πολλάκις ταύτην τὴν μουσικήν μοι ἐπιτάττοι ποιεῖν. ἦν γὰρ δὴ ἄττα τοιάδε· πολλάκις μοι φοιτῶν τὸ αὐτὸ ἐνύπνιον ἐν τῷ παρελθόντι βίῳ, ἄλλοτ' ἐν ἄλλῃ ὄψει φαινόμενον, τὰ αὐτὰ δὲ λέγον, "Ὦ Σώκρατες," ἔφη, "μουσικὴν ποίει καὶ ἐργάζου." καὶ ἐγὼ ἔν γε τῷ πρόσθεν χρόνῳ ὅπερ ἔπραττον τοῦτο ὑπελάμβανον αὐτό μοι παρακελεύεσθαί τε [61a] καὶ ἐπικελεύειν, ὥσπερ οἱ τοῖς θέουσι διακελευόμενοι, καὶ ἐμοὶ οὕτω τὸ ἐνύπνιον ὅπερ ἔπραττον τοῦτο ἐπικελεύειν, μουσικὴν ποιεῖν, ὡς φιλοσοφίας μὲν οὔσης μεγίστης μουσικῆς, ἐμοῦ δὲ τοῦτο πράττοντος. νῦν δ' ἐπειδὴ ἥ τε δίκη ἐγένετο καὶ ἡ τοῦ θεοῦ ἑορτὴ διεκώλυέ με ἀποθνῄσκειν, ἔδοξε χρῆναι, εἰ ἄρα πολλάκις μοι προστάττοι τὸ ἐνύπνιον ταύτην τὴν δημώδη μουσικὴν ποιεῖν, μὴ ἀπειθῆσαι αὐτῷ ἀλλὰ ποιεῖν· ἀσφαλέστερον γὰρ εἶναι μὴ [b] ἀπιέναι πρὶν ἀφοσιώσασθαι ποιήσαντα ποιήματα πειθόμενον τῷ ἐνυπνίῳ. οὕτω δὴ πρῶτον μὲν εἰς τὸν θεὸν ἐποίησα οὗ ἦν ἡ παροῦσα θυσία· μετὰ δὲ τὸν θεόν, ἐννοήσας ὅτι τὸν ποιητὴν δέοι, εἴπερ μέλλοι ποιητὴς εἶναι, ποιεῖν μύθους ἀλλ' οὐ λόγους, καὶ αὐτὸς οὐκ ἦ μυθολογικός, διὰ ταῦτα δὴ οὓς προχείρους εἶχον καὶ ἠπιστάμην, τοὺς Αἰσώπου, τούτων ἐποίησα οἷς πρώτοις ἐνέτυχον. ταῦτα οὖν, ὦ Κέβης, Εὐήνῳ φράζε, καὶ ἐρρῶσθαι καί,

ἂν σωφρονῇ, ἐμὲ διώκειν ὡς τάχιστα. ἄπειμι δέ, ὡς ἔοικε, [c] τήμερον· κελεύουσι γὰρ Ἀθηναῖοι.

46T2 Plu. *Mor.* 16C

ὅθεν ὁ Σωκράτης ἔκ τινων ἐνυπνίων ποιητικῆς ἁψάμενος αὐτὸς μέν, ἅτε δὴ γεγονὼς ἀληθείας ἀγωνιστὴς τὸν ἅπαντα βίον, οὐ πιθανὸς ἦν οὐδ' εὐφυὴς ψευδῶν δημιουργός, τοὺς δ' Αἰσώπου μύθους ἔπεσιν ἐνήρμοζεν ὡς ποίησιν οὐκ οὖσαν ᾗ ψεῦδος μὴ πρόσεστι. θυσίας μὲν γὰρ ἀχόρους καὶ ἀναύλους ἴσμεν, οὐκ ἴσμεν δ' ἄμυθον οὐδ' ἀψευδῆ ποίησιν.

46T3 Aug. *Cons. Evang.* 1.12

Socrates autem, quem rursus in activa, qua mores informantur, omnibus praetulerunt, ita ut testimonio quoque dei sui Apollinis omnium sapientissimum pronuntiatum esse non taceant, Aesopi fabulas pauculis versibus persecutus est, verba et numeros suos adhibens rebus alterius, usque adeo nihil scribere voluit, ut hoc se coactum imperio sui daemonis fecisse dixerit, sicut nobilissimus discipulorum eius Plato commemorat: in quo tamen opere maluit alienas quam suas exornare sententias.

46T4 Syn. *Dion* 15

εἰ δέ τινα τὰ κατὰ Ἀσπασίαν τε καὶ Σωκράτην ἐρωτικὰ ἐννενόηκας, οὐκ ἀπιστήσεις ὅτι φιλοσοφία τὰς τελεωτάτας ἐποπτεύσασα τελετάς, ἁπανταχοῦ τὸ καλὸν ἐπιγνώσεται καὶ ἀσπάσεται, καὶ ῥητορικὴν ἐπαινέσεται, καὶ ἀσπασίως καὶ ποιητικῆς ἀνθέξεται· ταύτην μὲν γὰρ ἄντικρυς εἰργάσατο καὶ Σωκράτης, οὐχ ὁ παῖς οὐδ' ὁ νέος Σωκράτης, ἀλλ' ὁ μετὰ τὴν ἡλιαίαν ἤδη δίαιταν ἔχων ἐν τῷ δεσμωτηρίῳ, ὁπηνίκα παίζειν ἥκιστα καιρὸς ἦν τηλικῷδε ὄντι καὶ ἐν τοιούτοις, οὔπω λέγω, δεινοῖς· τί γὰρ ἂν καὶ δεινὸν Σωκράτει; ἀλλ' οὐδὲ μέντοι παίζειν ἀξιοῖς· ὁ δὲ τῷ θεῷ φησι πείθεσθαι. καὶ μὴ ἀπιστῶμεν· ᾠκειοῦτο γὰρ αὐτὸν τῇ κοινωνίᾳ τοῦ ἔργου.

46T5 Avian. *Praef.*

[praecedit Avian. G59]

Verum has pro exemplo fabulas et Socrates diuinis operibus indidit et poemati suo Flaccus aptauit, quod in se sub iocorum communium specie uitae argumenta contineant.

[pergit testimonium]

46T6 Psel. *Orat.* 25.169-174 Littlewood

Σωκράτης μουσικὴν ποιεῖν καὶ ἐργάζεσθαι παρὰ τοῦ ἐνυπνίου κελευόμενος τῇ φιλοσοφίᾳ ἐπέτεινεν ἑαυτόν, ὡς δὲ πολλάκις τὸ αὐτὸ ἐφοίτα ἐνύπνιον, ἔγνω ὃ βούλεται καὶ τοὺς Αἰσώπου μύθους ἐντείνας ἀφωσιώσατο· οὕτω μουσικὴ ὁ μῦθος αὐτόχρημα καὶ κρείττω[ν] φιλοσοφίας [π]αρὰ τοῖς κρείττοσι.

47. *Democritus*

47T1 Stob. 3.10.68
Δημοκρίτου.
[sequitur Democr. 47A1]

47A1 Democr. 68B224 Diels-Kranz
[praecedit Democr. 47T1 (Stob.)]
ἡ τοῦ πλέονος ἐπιθυμίη τὸ παρεὸν ἀπόλλυσι, τῇ Αἰσωπείῃ κυνὶ ἰκέλη γινομένη.

48. *Antisthenes*

48T1 Arist. *Pol.* 3.13, 1284a15-17
[vide Arist. 52A1]

48F/A1 Antisth. fr. 100 Caizzi ?
[= Antisth. 48T1]

49. *Plato*

49T1 Theon, *Prog.* 3 (Spengel II 73)
[praecedit Theon, G20c]
Πλάτων δὲ ἐν διαλόγῳ τῷ περὶ ψυχῆς πῆ μὲν μῦθον, πῆ δὲ λόγον ὀνομάζει·...
[pergit testimonium]

49T2 Zen. 6.28
[praecedit D. 40T4]
..., καὶ ὁ Πλάτων δέ,
καὶ ἄλλοι πολλοί. Καὶ Ἀρχίππῳ δὲ κωμῳδία γέγονεν, Ὄνου σκιά. Τάττεται δὲ ἐπὶ τῶν περὶ μηδένος χρησίμου φιλοτιμουμένων.

49T3 Iamb. *in Phdr.* fr. 7 Dillon *ap.* Herm. ib. 259b
[praecedit Pl. 49T6b (Herm.)]
Ἡ δὲ ἐξήγησις τοῦ θείου Ἰαμβλίχου ῥηθήσεται νῦν· ἀνθρώπους λέγει τὰς ψυχὰς τὰς ἐν τῷ νοητῷ διατριψάσας· αἱ γὰρ ψυχαί, πρὶν τὸν θνητὸν βίον διαζήσωσιν, ἄνω εἰσὶν ἐν τῷ νοητῷ, αὐτὰ τὰ εἴδη θεωροῦσαι, ἅμα τοῖς θεοῖς τοῖς ὑπερκοσμίοις οὖσαι· οὕτως οὖν οἱ ἄνθρωποι ἦσαν πρὶν γενέσθαι τὰς Μούσας, τουτέστι τὰς σφαίρας καὶ τὸν αἰσθητὸν κόσμον. τὸ δὲ 'πρίν γε' μὴ χρόνῳ ἀκούσῃς ἀλλὰ πρὶν εἰς τὸ ἐμφανὲς ταύτην τὴν

πρόοδον γενέσθαι τῶν σφαιρῶν· αὕτη γάρ ἐστιν ἡ γένεσις τῶν Μουσῶν ἡ ἔκφανσις ἡ ἀπὸ τοῦ δημιουργοῦ γενομένη εἰς τὸν αἰσθητὸν κόσμον. ἦσαν οὖν οἱ ἄνθρωποι ἐν τῷ νοητῷ κόσμῳ· ἅμα οὖν ἐγένοντο αἱ Μοῦσαι καὶ αἱ σφαῖραι καὶ ὁ αἰσθητὸς κόσμος καὶ ἡ ὅλη ψυχὴ τοῦ παντὸς κόσμου, συμπροῆλθον καὶ αἱ μερικαὶ ψυχαὶ αἱ τῶν ἀνθρώπων· καὶ ἅτε δὴ νεοτελεῖς οὖσαι καὶ μνήμην ἔχουσαι τῶν ἐκεῖ, ἀπόστροφοι ἦσαν τῆς γενέσεως καὶ οὐκ ἤθελον οὐδὲ φαγεῖν οὐδὲ πιεῖν, τουτέστι μεταλαβεῖν αἰσθητῆς δόξης οὐκ ἠβούλοντο· εἶχον γὰρ τὴν νοητὴν τροφήν· διὸ ὑπὸ λιμοῦ τῶν ἐνταῦθα ἀπέθανον, ἀντὶ τοῦ ἀνήχθησαν.

49T4 Tim. *Lex.* sv ἀλωπεκῆν

τὴν ἀλωπεκῆν· τὴν πανουργίαν.

49T5 Them. *Or.* 21, 246a

ἀλλὰ τοῦτο ἀνδρὶ μὲν ἐπαίνους θηρεύοντι καὶ σφόδρα ἀλγεινὸν καὶ [246α] ἀτύχημα σοφιστοῦ, φιλοσόφου δὲ οὐδέν τι μεῖον ὁ λόγος εὖ ἔχει, κἂν ὑπὸ πλατάνῳ λέγηται μόνῃ, κἂν τεττίγων ἀκροωμένων. εἰ γὰρ δὴ καὶ ἐπαίνου προσδεῖται, δεῖ μὲν οὐδέν, ἀποχρήσει δὲ αὐτῷ καὶ εἷς ἐπαινέτης Φαῖδρος ὁ Μυρρινούσιος. οἱ τέττιγες δὴ ᾄσονται καὶ προσᾴσονται τῇ μεσημβρίᾳ καὶ τῷ ἡλίῳ.

ἀλλὰ τί ταῦτά ἐστι πρὸς ἐμέ;

49T6a Herm. *in Phdr.* 258e

Σχολὴ μὲν δὴ ὡς ἔοικε]

Μῦθον βούλεται εἰπεῖν, διὰ τοῦ μύθου διεγείρων ἡμᾶς, καὶ οὐκ ἐῶν νυστάζειν καὶ ἀργοὺς εἶναι τὴν διάνοιαν.

49T6b ib. 259b

Λέγεται δὲ ὡς ποτ' ἦσαν]

Ἡ θεωρία τοῦ μύθου αὕτη ἐστί· τινὲς μὲν γάρ φασιν ὅτι πρὶν γενέσθαι Μούσας καὶ πρὶν γενέσθαι μουσικὴν [λέγουσιν ὅτι] ἦσαν οἱ ἄνθρωποι ἄμουσοι· γενομένων δὲ τῶν Μουσῶν ἐγένοντο μουσικοί· πῶς γὰρ οὐκ ἄτοπον πρὸ τῶν θεῶν τοὺς ἀνθρώπους γεγονέναι;

[sequitur Pl. 49T3 (Iamb.)]

49T6c ibid.

Γενομένων δὲ Μουσῶν]

Τουτέστι προόδου γενομένης καὶ τοῦ αἰσθητοῦ κόσμου τούτου φανέντος, καὶ φανείσης ᾠδῆς καὶ ἁρμονίας· ἁρμονία δέ ἐστιν ἐν νοῖς καὶ ἐν ψυχαῖς καὶ ἐν ταῖς σφαίραις καὶ ἐν πᾶσιν.—Ὑφ' ἡδονῆς δέ, τουτέστιν ὑπὸ τῆς θείας εὐφροσύνης.—Τὸ δὲ ἔλαθον τελευτήσαντες· ὁρᾷς ὅτι καὶ ἐνταῦθα ὁ τῷ ὄντι φιλόσοφος ὁ πρὸς τοῖς οὖσι διατρίβων τὰ ἐμποδὼν οὐχ ὁρᾷ ὡς καὶ ἐν Θεαιτήτῳ εἶπε περὶ τοῦ κορυφαίου· οὗτοι οὖν οἱ ἄνθρωποι τῶν αἰσθητῶν καταφρονήσαντες ἀνήχθησαν ἐκπληττόμενοι τὴν θείαν ἁρμονίαν. Ἐξ ὧν δὲ τῶν τεττίγων, δῆλον, τουτέστιν αἱ ψυχαὶ

αὗται μουσικαὶ ἐγένοντο καὶ θεοί τινες.—Τὸ δὲ γέρας τοῦτο· λόγος ⟨ἔστιν⟩ ὅτι καὶ οἱ τέττιγες οὐ δέονται τροφῆς ἀλλ' ἀρκοῦνται τῇ δρόσῳ· ἡ δὲ θεωρία ὅτι ὁ κατὰ νοῦν ζῶν καὶ φιλόμουσος καὶ φιλόσοφος βουλόμενος ἀναχθῆναι πρὸς τοὺς θεοὺς οὐ δεῖται τῆς ἐπιμελείας τοῦ σώματος καὶ τῆς σωματικῆς ζωῆς, ἀλλὰ οὐδὲν ἡγεῖται αὐτήν, ἀποστῆναι αὐτῆς βουλόμενος· μελετᾷ γὰρ θάνατον, τουτέστιν ἀπόστασιν ταύτης τῆς ζωῆς· οἶδε γὰρ ὅτι πρὸς ὄχλον αὐτῷ ἐστι τὸ σῶμα. Τὸ δὲ γέρας τὸ ὀπαδὸν γενέσθαι τοῦ οἰκείου θεοῦ· καθὼς δὲ ἤδη εἴπομεν ὅτι ἐν τῷ Συμποσίῳ εἶπεν ὅτι τὸ δαιμόνιον πᾶν μεταξύ ἐστι θεῶν καὶ ἀνθρώπων, διαπορθμεῦον τὰ ἡμέτερα πρὸς τοὺς θεούς· εἰδέναι δὲ δεῖ ὅτι τὸ μὲν θεῖον ἀμέσως πᾶσι πάρεστιν, ἡμεῖς δὲ ἀμέσως τῷ θείῳ συναφθῆναι οὐ δυνάμεθα μὴ διὰ μέσου τινός, οἷον τοῦ δαιμονίου, ὥσπερ ἐπὶ τοῦ φωτὸς δεόμεθα τοῦ ἀέρος τοῦ διακινοῦντος ἡμῖν τὸ φῶς. Ὃ λέγει οὖν αὐτῶν γέρας τοῦτό ἐστιν, ὅτι, φησίν, [ὅπῃ] οἱ δαίμονες ἢ αἱ ψυχαὶ ἐλθοῦσαι παρὰ Μούσας ἀπαγγέλλουσι τὰς εὐζωίας καὶ κακοζωίας τῶν ἀνθρώπων, τίς τίνα τῶν θεῶν ἐτίμησεν ἢ οὔ.

49T6d ib. 259c

Τερψιχόρᾳ]

Ἀπαγγέλλουσι δὲ χορείαν οὐχ οἵαν οἱ ὀρχησταὶ ὀρχοῦνται· καταγέλαστος γὰρ αὕτη· εἰσὶ δὲ θεῖαι χορεῖαι· πρῶτον μὲν ἡ τῶν θεῶν, ἔπειτα ἡ τῶν ψυχῶν τῶν θείων, ἔπειτα δὲ ἡ τῶν κατ' οὐρανὸν θεῶν περιπόλησις χορεία λέγεται, ἣν οἱ ἑπτὰ θεοὶ καὶ οἱ ἀπλανεῖς χορεύουσιν· ἔπειτα καὶ ἐνταῦθα οἱ τελούμενοι τοῖς θεοῖς χορείαν τινὰ ἀποτελοῦσιν ἐν τοῖς μυστηρίοις· καὶ ἡ πᾶσα δὲ ζωὴ τοῦ φιλοσόφου χορεία ἐστί.—Τερψιχόρα οὖν ἐστιν ἡ πάσης χορείας ἔφορος. Τίνες οὖν οἱ τιμῶντες ἐν τῇ χορείᾳ τὸν θεόν; οὐχ οἱ καλῶς ὀρχούμενοι, ἀλλ' οἱ καλῶς διαζῶντες τὸν ἐνταῦθα βίον, καὶ ῥυθμίζοντες αὐτῶν πᾶσαν τὴν ζωήν, καὶ συμφώνως τῷ παντὶ χορεύοντες.

49T6e ib. 259d

Τῇ δὲ Ἐρατοῖ]

Ἐρατὼ ἐκλήθη παρὰ τὸ ἐρᾶν καὶ ἐράσμια ποιεῖν τὰ τοῦ Ἔρωτος ἔργα· συνεργὸς γὰρ αὕτη τῷ Ἔρωτι. Τερψιχόρα οὖν παρὰ τὴν χορείαν ἐρρέθη, ἡ δὲ Ἐρατὼ παρὰ τὸ ἐρᾶν. Τοὺς ἐν τοῖς ἐρωτικοῖς οὖν τετιμηκότας αὐτὴν ἀπαγγέλλουσιν· οἱ γὰρ αἰσχρῶς τῷ ἔρωτι χρώμενοι ὑβρίζουσιν αὐτήν.—Τὸ δὲ κατὰ τὸ εἶδος ἑκάστης τιμῆς, τουτέστι κατὰ τὰ ἰδιώματα ἑκάστης θεοῦ.

49T6f ibid.

Τῇ δὲ πρεσβυτάτῃ Καλλιόπῃ]

Πρεσβυτάτην εἶπεν, ἐπειδὴ καὶ ἐν ταῖς Μούσαις τάξις ἐστὶ πρώτων καὶ μέσων καὶ τελευταίων, ἃ τῆς φιλοσοφίας ὑπάρχει. Καλλιόπη δὲ ἐκλήθη παρὰ τὴν ὄπα. Τοὺς ἐν λόγοις οὖν αὐτὴν τετιμηκότας ἀπαγγέλλουσι, τῇ δὲ Οὐρανίᾳ τοὺς ἀστρονομήσαντας· διὰ γὰρ τούτων τῶν δύο θεῶν τὸ ἐν ἡμῖν πεπλανημένον σῴζομεν· διὰ γὰρ τῆς ὁράσεως τὴν

τάξιν τῶν οὐρανίων θεῶν θεώμενοι τάττομεν τὸ ἐν ἡμῖν ἄλογον· ἔτι γε μὴν διὰ ῥυθμῶν καὶ φιλοσοφίας καὶ ἀκοῆς ῥυθμίζομεν τὸ ἐν ἡμῖν ἄτακτον καὶ ἄρρυθμον· δεῖ δὲ ἀστρονομεῖν οὐ ναυτικῶς, οὐδὲ ἁπλῶς τὰς κινήσεις τῶν οὐρανίων θεῶν εἰδέναι, ἀλλὰ τὴν τάξιν τὴν οὐρανίαν θεωμένους τὸ ἐν ἡμῖν ἄλογον κατατάττειν.—Τὸ δὲ ἴασι καλλίστην φωνήν· καὶ γὰρ λέγεται ⟨ὅτι⟩ ὁ Πυθαγόρας ᾔσθετο τῆς οὐρανίας φωνῆς· καί τινες δὲ τὰ ὀνόματα τῶν χορδῶν ἐκ τῶν οὐρανίων σφαιρῶν ὠνόμασαν, οἷον ὅτι προσλαμβανομένη ἐστὶν ἡ τοῦ Κρόνου σφαῖρα, καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν ἄλλων ὁμοίως ἄλλας χορδὰς εἶπον.

49T6g ibid.

Πολλῶν δὴ οὕνεκα]

Διὰ δὴ σύμπαντα ταῦτα τὰ εἰρημένα οὐκ ὀφείλομεν καθεύδειν, ἀλλὰ τὸ νοερὸν τὸ ⟨τὴν⟩ ἐν ἡμῖν οἰκειότητα φέρον πρὸς τοὺς θεοὺς διεγείρειν· διεγείρομεν δὲ τὸ νοερὸν διὰ τοῦ διαλέγεσθαι.

49T7 Herm. *in Phdr.* 272c

Παροιμία ἐστὶ λεγομένη, ὅτι

λύκος ἑωρακὼς ποιμένας, ἤγουν κύνας, πρόβατον κατεσθίοντάς φησιν· "εἰ ἐγὼ τοῦτο ἐποίουν, πόσος ἂν θόρυβος ἐγεγόνει."

Ἐπειδὴ οὖν μακρότερα εἶπε περὶ τῆς ῥητορικῆς τῆς ἀληθοῦς, διὰ τοῦτο τῆς παροιμίας ἐμνήσθη, ὅτι εἶπον ἂν οἱ τῆς δημώδους ῥητορικῆς προστάται πρὸς τὸ πλῆθος τῶν εἰρημένων λόγων· "εἰ δὲ ἡμεῖς οὕτως ἐμηκύναμεν τὸν λόγον, ποῖος ἂν ἐγεγόνει θόρυβος παρὰ τοῖς φιλοσόφοις."

49T8 Σ (Procl. ?) *in Alc.* I 123a

τὸν Αἰσώπου μῦθον] ὁ μῦθος τοιοῦτος.

λέων μὴ οἷός τε διὰ γῆρας θηρεύειν ὧν προσεποιεῖτο νοσεῖν, ἵνα δὴ τὰ θηρία πρὸς ἐπίσκεψιν ἰόντα παρ' αὐτὸν κατεσθίοιτο. δεινὴ δ' ἀλώπηξ οὖσα τὸν δόλον συνιδεῖν ἐφώρασεν, τοῦ λέοντος αὐτὴν ἀξιοῦντος εἰσελθεῖν πρὸς αὐτόν, φαμένη μὴ δύνασθαι εἰσιέναι· ὁρῶσα ἴχνη μὲν εἰσιόντων, ἐξιόντων δ' οὔ.

49T9a Σ *in Phdr.* 259b

λέγεται δ' ὥς]

μῦθος περὶ τεττίγων.

49T9b ibid. 259c

γέρας τοῦτο] σημείωσαι ὅτι τοὺς τέττιγας λέγεται τὸ παράπαν μὴ δεῖσθαι τροφῆς, τῇ δὲ δρόσῳ ἀρκεῖσθαι μόνῃ.

49T9c ibid. 259d

ἴασιν] πέμπουσι.

49T9d ib. 260c
[vide D. 40T6]

49T10 ib. 272c
τὸ τοῦ λύκου εἰπεῖν. παροιμία λύκου ῥήματα, ἐπὶ τοῦ καὶ λόγοις καὶ ἔργοις ἀδικοῦντος.

ἰδὼν γὰρ λύκος ποιμένα ἐσθίοντα προβάτεια εἶπεν "ἡλίκος ἂν ἤρθη θόρυβος, εἰ ἐγὼ ταῦτ' ἐποίουν;"

ἐμνήσθη ταύτης ἐνταῦθα Πλάτων.

49T11 Σ *in* Pl. *Tht.* 200e
δείξειν αὐτό. παροιμία· ὁ τὸν ποταμὸν καθηγούμενος, αὐτὸ δείξει. ἐπὶ τῶν ἐκ τῆς πείρας γινωσκομένων.

κατιόντων γάρ τινων εἰς ποταμὸν πρὸς τὸ διαπεράσαι, ἤρετό τις τὸν προηγούμενον εἰ βάθος ἔχοι τὸ ὕδωρ· ὁ δὲ ἔφη "αὐτὸ δείξει."

49T12a Olymp. *in Alc.* 122b-124a
καὶ τῷ ἑτεροκινητῷ δὲ πλούτῳ ὑπερεῖχον, εἴγε λέγεται περὶ αὐτῶν ὅτι δύο μοίρας τῶν προσόδων ἀπῄτουν τοὺς ὑπηκόους, καὶ ὅτι λέγονται εἶναι φλέβες ἀργυρίτιδες καὶ χρυσίτιδες· καὶ τὸ 'πολυχρύσοιο Μυκήνης'· καὶ ὅτι λέγεται περὶ αὐτῶν ὅτι εἰσιὸν τὸ χρυσίον παρ' αὐτοῖς οὐκ ἔτι ἐξῄει. διὸ καὶ κέχρηται μύθῳ τοιούτῳ προσφόρῳ, ὅτι

λέγεταί ποτε λέων γηράσας προσποιήσασθαι νόσον· καὶ εἰσελθεῖν τὰ ἄλλα θηρία εἰς ἐπίσκεψιν αὐτοῦ, καὶ ταῦτα ἐκεῖνον λαμβάνοντα ἐσθίειν καὶ ἀπολλύναι. τὴν δὲ ἀλώπεκα κερδὼ οὖσαν μὴ ἀνασχομένην εἰσελθεῖν, εἰπεῖν μηδαμῶς τοῦτο ποιῆσαι, διότι ἴχνη μὲν ὁρᾷ τῶν εἰσιόντων πρὸς αὐτόν, οὐ μὴν δὲ τῶν ἐξιόντων, καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ μὲν οὐδοῦ προσιόντων ἔνδον ἴχνη βλέπειν, οὐ μὴν ἐπὶ τὸν οὐδὸν μετερχομένων. οὕτως οὖν καὶ παρὰ Λακεδαιμονίους τὸ νόμισμα εἰσιέναι μέν φησιν, οὐκ ἔτι δὲ ἐξιέναι.

ἀπεικάζει δὲ αὐτοὺς λέοντι γεγηρακότι, διότι κατὰ ἀριστοκρατίαν ζῶντες, ᾗ οἰκεῖος ὁ λέων, ἐκνενευρισμένην αὐτὴν ἐποίησαν, ὡς κινδυνεύειν ἀπὸ ἀριστοκρατίας εἰς ὀλιγαρχίαν μεταπεσεῖν.

49T12b ib. 122e
καὶ παράγει λοιπὸν

τὸ παράδειγμα τῆς ἀλώπεκος,

χαριέντως καὶ προσφόρως πεφρασμένον. ἡ γὰρ Πλατωνικὴ χάρις ἀεὶ ἀκμάζει, μηδέποτε γηρῶσα.

49T12c ib. 123a

μετέβαλε τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ λέοντος εἰς τὸ νόμισμα· θηρίῳ γὰρ ἀπείκασεν αὐτό.

49T13 Barb. *Aes. fab. Praef.*

Non erubuit profecto praestantissimus et optimus vitae magister Plato ac sapientissimus dissertissimusque vivendi dux Plutarchus suis scriptis Aesopi sales, urbanitates et exempla tamquam flosculos et instituta interserere, quin immo et pulchritudini rerum suarum et decori futurum esse intellexerunt, si eius dicta gravitate comitateque referta interessent.

49T14 Abst. *Praef.* (p. 534 Neveletus)

[praecedunt Stesich. 7T9 Hes. 2T43]

...verum etiam maximi & celeberrimi Philosophi, vt Plato,...

[sequitur Arist. 52T2]

49T15 Erasm. *Adag.* 1.5.74

[praecedit Arist. 57T4]

Hujus idem Lucianus cum aliis compluribus locis meminit, tum in Dialogo de hæresibus [*Herm.* 20], *hujusmodi quandam de eo fabulam refert. Minervam, Neptunum, & Vulcanum de principatu artificii inter se contendisse. Et ut quisque artis suæ præcipuum aliquod specimen ederet, Neptunum taurum quendam finxisse, Minervam domum excogitasse, Vulcanum hominem composuisse.* Momus *delectus arbiter certaminis, & artis expensor. Ille inspecto uniuscujusque opere, præter alia quæ in reliquorum operibus reprehendit, illud potissimum in hominis opificio notavit, quod artifex non in pectore fenestras aut ostiola quædam addidisset, quo perspici posset quid in corde lateret, quod illi specuosum alioqui, multisque recessibus sinuosum finxisset:*

Cujus fabulæ mentionem facit & Plato.

Philostratus in Epistola quadam [37] *ad uxorem, de* Momo *scribit in hanc fere sententiam. Hunc in Venere nihil alioqui quod reprehenderet invenisse, nisi quod sandalium illius calumniabatur, ut stridulum, nimisque loquax, ac strepitu molestum. Quod si Venus citra sandalium incessisset, ita ut emersit a mari, tota nuda, nullam omnino ansam carpendi Momus invenisset. Qui quidem Deus tametsi non perinde gratus est atque cæteri, propterea quod pauci veram reprehensionem libenter admittant, tamen haud scio an ullus alius e maxima poeticorum Deorum turba sit utilior. Quanquam nunc nostri Joves excluso* Momo *solam Euterpen audiant, blanda salutaribus anteponentes. Hic igitur Momus varias adagiorum formas suppeditat. Vel cum Plato De Republica lib. VI* [2, 487a] *scribit, Philosophiæ studium esse ejusmodi, ut ne a* Momo *quidem possit reprehendi. Vel cum Venus Lucianica jam itura in judicium* [*D.Iud.* 2], *negat se dubitaturam, etiamsi* Momus *ipse judicaturus esset.*

49F1 Pl. *Phd.* 60c

...· ὁ δὲ Σωκράτης ἀνακαθιζόμενος εἰς τὴν κλίνην συνέκαμψέ τε τὸ σκέλος καὶ ἐξέτριψε τῇ χειρί, καὶ τρίβων ἅμα, Ὡς ἄτοπον, ἔφη, ὦ ἄνδρες, ἔοικέ τι εἶναι τοῦτο ὃ καλοῦσιν οἱ ἄνθρωποι ἡδύ· ὡς θαυμασίως πέφυκε πρὸς τὸ δοκοῦν ἐναντίον εἶναι, τὸ λυπηρόν, τὸ ἅμα μὲν αὐτὼ μὴ

ἐθέλειν παραγίγνεσθαι τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ, ἐὰν δέ τις διώκῃ τὸ ἕτερον καὶ λαμβάνῃ, σχεδόν τι ἀναγκάζεσθαι ἀεὶ λαμβάνειν καὶ τὸ ἕτερον, ὥσπερ ἐκ μιᾶς κορυφῆς ἡμμένω [c] δύ' ὄντε. καί μοι δοκεῖ, ἔφη, εἰ ἐνενόησεν αὐτὰ Αἴσωπος, μῦθον ἂν συνθεῖναι ὡς

ὁ θεὸς βουλόμενος αὐτὰ διαλλάξαι πολεμοῦντα, ἐπειδὴ οὐκ ἐδύνατο, συνῆψεν εἰς ταὐτὸν αὐτοῖς τὰς κορυφάς, καὶ διὰ ταῦτα ᾧ ἂν τὸ ἕτερον παραγένηται ἐπακολουθεῖ ὕστερον καὶ τὸ ἕτερον.

ὥσπερ οὖν καὶ αὐτῷ μοι ἔοικεν· ἐπειδὴ ὑπὸ τοῦ δεσμοῦ ἦν ἐν τῷ σκέλει τὸ ἀλγεινόν, ἥκειν δὴ φαίνεται ἐπακολουθοῦν τὸ ἡδύ.

[sequitur Socr. 46T1]

49F2 Pl. *Phdr.* 259b-d

ΣΩΚΡΑΤΗΣ

Σχολὴ μὲν δή, ὡς ἔοικε· καὶ ἅμα μοι δοκοῦσιν ὡς ἐν τῷ πνίγει ὑπὲρ κεφαλῆς ἡμῶν οἱ τέττιγες ᾄδοντες καὶ [259a] ἀλλήλοις διαλεγόμενοι καθορᾶν καὶ ἡμᾶς. εἰ οὖν ἴδοιεν καὶ νὼ καθάπερ τοὺς πολλοὺς ἐν μεσημβρίᾳ μὴ διαλεγομένους ἀλλὰ νυστάζοντας καὶ κηλουμένους ὑφ' αὑτῶν δι' ἀργίαν τῆς διανοίας, δικαίως ἂν καταγελῷεν, ἡγούμενοι ἀνδράποδ' ἄττα σφίσιν ἐλθόντα εἰς τὸ καταγώγιον ὥσπερ προβάτια μεσημβριάζοντα περὶ τὴν κρήνην εὕδειν· ἐὰν δὲ ὁρῶσι διαλεγομένους καὶ παραπλέοντάς σφας ὥσπερ Σειρῆνας [b] ἀκηλήτους, ὃ γέρας παρὰ θεῶν ἔχουσιν ἀνθρώποις διδόναι, τάχ' ἂν δοῖεν ἀγασθέντες.

ΦΑΙΔΡΟΣ

Ἔχουσι δὲ δὴ τί τοῦτο; ἀνήκοος γάρ, ὡς ἔοικε, τυγχάνω ὤν.

ΣΩ. Οὐ μὲν δὴ πρέπει γε φιλόμουσον ἄνδρα τῶν τοιούτων ἀνήκοον εἶναι. λέγεται δ' ὥς

ποτ' ἦσαν οὗτοι ἄνθρωποι τῶν πρὶν Μούσας γεγονέναι, γενομένων δὲ Μουσῶν καὶ φανείσης ᾠδῆς οὕτως ἄρα τινὲς τῶν τότε ἐξεπλάγησαν ὑφ' ἡδονῆς, [c] ὥστε ᾄδοντες ἠμέλησαν σίτων τε καὶ ποτῶν, καὶ ἔλαθον τελευτήσαντες αὑτούς· ἐξ ὧν τὸ τεττίγων γένος μετ' ἐκεῖνο φύεται, γέρας τοῦτο παρὰ Μουσῶν λαβόν, μηδὲν τροφῆς δεῖσθαι γενόμενον, ἀλλ' ἄσιτόν τε καὶ ἄποτον εὐθὺς ᾄδειν, ἕως ἂν τελευτήσῃ, καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα ἐλθὸν παρὰ Μούσας ἀπαγγέλλειν τίς τίνα αὐτῶν τιμᾷ τῶν ἐνθάδε. Τερψιχόρᾳ μὲν οὖν τοὺς ἐν τοῖς χοροῖς τετιμηκότας αὐτὴν ἀπαγγέλ- [d] λοντες ποιοῦσι προσφιλεστέρους, τῇ δὲ Ἐρατοῖ τοὺς ἐν τοῖς ἐρωτικοῖς, καὶ ταῖς ἄλλαις οὕτως, κατὰ τὸ εἶδος ἑκάστης τιμῆς· τῇ δὲ πρεσβυτάτῃ Καλλιόπῃ καὶ τῇ μετ' αὐτὴν Οὐρανίᾳ τοὺς ἐν φιλοσοφίᾳ διάγοντάς τε καὶ τιμῶντας τὴν ἐκείνων μουσικὴν ἀγγέλλουσιν, αἳ δὴ μάλιστα τῶν Μουσῶν περί τε οὐρανὸν καὶ λόγους οὖσαι θείους τε καὶ ἀνθρωπίνους ἱᾶσιν καλλίστην φωνήν.

πολλῶν δὴ οὖν ἕνεκα λεκτέον τι καὶ οὐ καθευδητέον ἐν τῇ μεσημβρίᾳ.

ΦΑΙ. Λεκτέον γὰρ οὖν.

49A1 Pl. *Alc.* I 123a

ΣΩΚΡΑΤΗΣ

..., χρυσίον δὲ καὶ ἀργύριον οὐκ ἔστιν ἐν πᾶσιν Ἕλλησιν ὅσον ἐν Λακεδαίμονι ἰδίᾳ· πολλὰς γὰρ ἤδη γενεὰς εἰσέρχεται μὲν αὐτόσε ἐξ ἁπάντων τῶν Ἑλλήνων, πολλάκις δὲ καὶ ἐκ τῶν βαρβάρων, ἐξέρχεται δὲ οὐδαμόσε, ἀλλ' ἀτεχνῶς

κατὰ τὸν Αἰσώπου μῦθον ὃν ἡ ἀλώπηξ πρὸς τὸν λέοντα εἶπεν,

καὶ τοῦ εἰς Λακεδαίμονα νομίσματος εἰσιόντος μὲν τὰ ἴχνη τὰ ἐκεῖσε τετραμμένα δῆλα, ἐξιόντος δὲ οὐδαμῇ ἄν τις ἴδοι. ὥστε εὖ χρὴ εἰδέναι ὅτι καὶ χρυσῷ καὶ ἀργύρῳ οἱ ἐκεῖ πλουσιώτατοί εἰσιν τῶν Ἑλλήνων, καὶ αὐτῶν ἐκείνων ὁ βασιλεύς·...

49A2 Pl. *R.* 2.8, 365c4-6

τὰ μὲν λεγόμενα δικαίῳ μὲν ὄντι μοι, ἐὰν μὴ καὶ δοκῶ ὄφελος οὐδέν φασιν εἶναι, πόνους δὲ καὶ ζημίας φανεράς· ἀδίκῳ δὲ δόξαν δικαιοσύνης παρεσκευασμένῳ θεσπέσιος βίος λέγεται. οὐκοῦν, ἐπειδὴ τό δοκεῖν, ὡς δηλοῦσί μοι οἱ σοφοί, καὶ τὰν ἀλάθειαν βιᾶται καὶ κύριον εὐδαιμονίας, ἐπὶ τοῦτο δὴ τρεπτέον ὅλως· πρόθυρα μὲν καὶ σχῆμα κύκλῳ περὶ ἐμαυτὸν σκιαγραφίαν ἀρετῆς περιγραπτέον,

τὴν δὲ σοφωτάτου Ἀρχιλόχου ἀλώπεκα ἑλκτέον ἐξόπισθεν κερδαλέαν καὶ ποικίλην.

"Ἀλλὰ γάρ, φησί τις, οὐ ῥᾴδιον ἀεὶ λανθάνειν κακὸν ὄντα." Οὐδὲ γὰρ ἄλλο οὐδὲν εὐπετές, φήσομεν, τῶν μεγάλων· ἀλλ' ὅμως, εἰ μέλλομεν εὐδαιμονήσειν, ταύτῃ ἰτέον, ὡς τὰ ἴχνη τῶν λόγων φέρει.

49A3 Pl. *Tht.* 200e

ΣΩΚΡΑΤΗΣ

Ὁ τὸν ποταμὸν καθηγούμενος, ὦ Θεαίτητε, ἔφη ἄρα δείξειν αὐτό·

καὶ τοῦτο ἐὰν ἰόντες ἐρευνῶμεν, τάχ' ἂν ἐμπόδιον γενόμενον αὐτὸ φήνειεν τὸ ζητούμενον, μένουσι δὲ δῆλον οὐδέν.

ΘΕΑΙΤΗΤΟΣ

Ὀρθῶς λέγεις· ἀλλ' ἴωμέν γε καὶ σκοπῶμεν.

50. *Xenophon*

50T1 Theon, *Prog.* 2 (Spengel II 65-66)

[praecedunt Hdt. 31T1, Philist. 33T1, Theopomp. Hist. 35T1]

..., καὶ Ξενοφῶντος ἐν τῷ δευτέρῳ τῶν ἀπομνημονευμάτων

ὁ τοῦ κυνὸς καὶ τῶν προβάτων [50F1].

50F1 X. *Mem.* 2.7.13-14

2.7.12 Ἐκ τούτων δὲ ἐπορίσθη μὲν ἀφορμή, ἐωνήθη δὲ ἔρια· καὶ ἐργαζόμεναι μὲν ἠρίστων, ἐργασάμεναι δὲ ἐδείπνουν, ἱλαραὶ δὲ ἀντὶ σκυθρωπῶν ἦσαν· καὶ ἀντὶ ὑφορωμένων ἑαυτοὺς ἡδέως ἀλλήλους ἑώρων, καὶ αἱ μὲν ὡς κηδεμόνα ἐφίλουν, ὁ δὲ ὡς ὠφελίμους ἠγάπα. τέλος δὲ ἐλθὼν πρὸς τὸν Σωκράτην χαίρων διηγεῖτο ταῦτά τε καὶ ὅτι αἰτιῶνται αὐτὸν μόνον τῶν ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ ἀργὸν ἐσθίειν. καὶ ὁ Σωκράτης ἔφη· 13 Εἶτα οὐ λέγεις αὐταῖς τὸν τοῦ κυνὸς λόγον; φασὶ γάρ,

ὅτε φωνήεντα ἦν τὰ ζῷα, τὴν οἶν πρὸς τὸν δεσπότην εἰπεῖν· Θαυμαστὸν ποιεῖς, ὃς ἡμῖν μὲν ταῖς καὶ ἔριά σοι καὶ ἄρνας καὶ τυρὸν παρεχούσαις οὐδὲν δίδως ὅ τι ἂν μὴ ἐκ τῆς γῆς λάβωμεν, τῷ δὲ κυνί, ὃς οὐδὲν τοιοῦτόν σοι παρέχει, μεταδίδως οὗπερ αὐτὸς ἔχεις σίτου. 14 τὸν κύνα οὖν ἀκούσαντα εἰπεῖν· Ναὶ μὰ Δί'· ἐγὼ γάρ εἰμι ὁ καὶ ὑμᾶς αὐτὰς σῴζων ὥστε μήτε ὑπ' ἀνθρώπων κλέπτεσθαι μήτε ὑπὸ λύκων ἁρπάζεσθαι· ἐπεὶ ὑμεῖς γε, εἰ μὴ ἐγὼ προφυλάττοιμι ὑμᾶς, οὐδ' ἂν νέμεσθαι δύναισθε, φοβούμεναι μὴ ἀπόλησθε. οὕτω δὴ λέγεται καὶ τὰ πρόβατα συγχωρῆσαι τὸν κύνα προτιμᾶσθαι.

καὶ σὺ οὖν ἐκείναις λέγε ὅτι ἀντὶ κυνὸς εἶ φύλαξ καὶ ἐπιμελητής, καὶ διὰ σὲ οὐδ' ὑφ' ἑνὸς ἀδικούμεναι ἀσφαλῶς τε καὶ ἡδέως ἐργαζόμεναι ζῶσιν.

51. *Phaedo*

51T1a Theon, *Prog.* 3 (Spengel II 74-75)

[praecedit Theon, G20c]

...ἔστι καὶ παρὰ τῷ Σωκρατικῷ Φαίδωνι μῦθος ἐν τῷ Ζωπύρῳ· τὴν μὲν γὰρ ἀρχὴν ἀπὸ τῆς αἰτιατικῆς ἔχει. φασὶ τοίνυν, ὦ Σώκρατες,

[sequitur Phaedo 51F1a]

[sequitur Phaedo 51T1b]

51T1b ib. II 75

[praecedit Phaedo 51T1a]

...· μικρὸν δὲ ὑποβὰς μετέβαλεν εἰς τὴν εὐθεῖαν οὕτω· καί μοι δοκεῖ

[sequitur Phaedo 51F1b]

καὶ τὰ ἑξῆς.

[pergit Theon, G20c]

51F1a Phaedo, *Zopyr.* fr. 1 Rossetti

[praecedit Phaedo 51T1a]

τὸν νεώτατον βασιλέως υἱὸν χαρίσασθαί τινι λέοντος σκύμνον·

[sequitur Phaedo 51T1b]

51F1b ibid.

[praecedit Phaedo 51T1b]

ὁ λέων σύντροφος ὢν τῷ παιδὶ νεανίσκῳ ἤδη ὄντι ἀκολουθεῖν ὅπου βαδίζοι, ὥστε οἵ γε Πέρσαι ἐρᾶν ἔφασαν τοῦ παιδὸς αὐτόν,

[pergit testimonium]

52. *Aristoteles*

52T1 Bocc. *Geneal.* 14.9.36-38

Harum quatruplicem fore speciem credo, quarum prima omnino ueritate caret in cortice, ut puta, quando animalia bruta aut eciam insensata inter se loquencia inducimus. Et autor harum permaximus fuit Esopus, uir Grecus antiquitate ac eciam grauitate uenerabilis. Et dato his non solum ciuile uulgus sed eciam agrestes utantur, ut plurimum,

non fastidiuit aliquando suis libris inserere Aristotiles, celestis ingenii uir et Perypatheticorum princeps philosophorum.

52T2 Abst. *Praef.* (p. 534 Neveletus)

[praecedunt Stesich. 7T9 Hes. 2T43 Pl. 49T14]

..*Aristoteles, Plutarchus, & multi alii plurimum commendarunt, & ad institutionem moralis & ciuilis vitæ non minimum facere arbitrati sunt.*

52A1 Arist. *Pol.* 3.13, 1284a15-17

εἰ δέ τις ἔστιν εἷς τοσοῦτον διαφέρων κατ' ἀρετῆς ὑπερβολήν, ἢ πλείους μὲν ἑνὸς μὴ μέντοι δυνατοὶ πλήρωμα παρασχέσθαι πόλεως, ὥστε μὴ συμβλητὴν εἶναι τὴν τῶν ἄλλων ἀρετὴν πάντων μηδὲ τὴν δύναμιν αὐτῶν τὴν πολιτικὴν πρὸς τὴν ἐκείνων, εἰ πλείους, εἰ δ' εἷς, τὴν ἐκείνου μόνον, οὐκέτι θετέον τούτους μέρος πόλεως· ἀδικήσονται γὰρ ἀξιούμενοι τῶν ἴσων, ἄνισοι τοσοῦτον κατ' ἀρετὴν ὄντες καὶ τὴν πολιτικὴν δύναμιν· ὥσπερ γὰρ θεὸν ἐν ἀνθρώποις εἰκὸς εἶναι τὸν τοιοῦτον. ὅθεν δῆλον ὅτι καὶ τὴν νομοθεσίαν ἀναγκαῖον εἶναι περὶ τοὺς ἴσους καὶ τῷ γένει καὶ τῇ δυνάμει, κατὰ δὲ τῶν τοιούτων οὐκ ἔστι νόμος· αὐτοὶ γάρ εἰσι νόμος. καὶ γὰρ γελοῖος ἂν εἴη νομοθετεῖν τις πειρώμενος κατ' αὐτῶν.

λέγοιεν γὰρ ἂν ἴσως ἅπερ Ἀντισθένης ἔφη τοὺς λέοντας δημηγορούντων τῶν δασυπόδων καὶ τὸ ἴσον ἀξιούντων πάντας ἔχειν.

53. *Menedemus Eretricus*

53T1 D.L. 2.17 (133)
[vide Achae. 15T1]

53T2 Erasm. *Adag.* 1.7.68
[vide Achae. 15T2]

53A1 Menedemus Eretr. *ap.* D.L. 2.17 (133)
[= 53T1]

54. *Epicurus*

54T1 Max. Tyr. 32.1-2
[praecedit Max. Tyr. G34]
ᾄδεται δή τις αὐτῷ [sc. Αἰσώπῳ] καὶ τοιοῦτος μῦθος.

ἔλαφον διώκει λέων. ἡ δὲ φεύγουσα ὑπεξάγει καὶ καταδύεται εἰς δρυμὸν βαθύν. ὁ δὲ λέων—ὅσα γὰρ ἀλκῇ προὔχει, τάχει λείπεται—ἐπιστὰς τῷ δρυμῷ ἐρωτᾷ ποιμένα εἴ που εἶδεν πτήξασαν τὴν ἔλαφον. ὁ δὲ ποιμὴν οὐκ ἔφη ἰδεῖν, καὶ ὁμοῦ λέγων τὴν χεῖρα ἀποτείνας ἔδειξε τὸ χωρίον. ᾤχετο ὁ λέων ἐπὶ τὴν δειλαίαν ἔλαφον. ἡ δὲ ἀλώπηξ...

- [pergit testimonium] -

...πρὸς τὸν ποιμένα λέγει· ὡς δειλὸς ἄρα καὶ πονηρὸς ἦσθα· δειλὸς μὲν πρὸς λέοντας, πονηρὸς δὲ ἐς ἐλάφους.

Δοκεῖ μοι δὴ χρήσασθαι ἂν καὶ ὁ Ἐπίκουρος τῷ Φρυγίῳ τούτῳ αἰνίγματι πρὸς τὸν τῆς ἡδονῆς κατήγορον, τῇ μὲν φωνῇ ἀνδριζόμενον, τῇ δὲ γνώμῃ, καθάπερ τῇ χειρί, ἐκτεινόμενον ἐφ' ἡδονῇ. τίς γὰρ οὕτω πολεμήσαι αὐτὸς αὐτῷ, ὥστε τὸ μόνον δὴ πραγμάτων τῇ αὐτοῦ φύσει ἐπαγωγότατον ἀποσείσασθαι ἑκών; τὰ μὲν ἄλλα ἃ ὑπ' ἀνθρώπων διώκεται ἢ πείρᾳ γνωρισθέντα παρεδέχθη, ἢ τέχνῃ δοκιμασθέντα ἐτιμήθη, ἢ λόγῳ ἐξετασθέντα ἐπιστεύθη, ἢ χρόνῳ βασανισθέντα ἠγαπήθη· ἡδονὴ δὲ καὶ λόγου ἀδεὴς καὶ τέχνης πρεσβυτέρα, καὶ τὴν πεῖραν φθάνει καὶ οὐκ ἀναμένει χρόνον, ἀλλὰ συμφυὴς ἡ πρὸς αὐτὴν φιλία καὶ ἡλικιῶτις τῶν σωμάτων ὥσπερ κρηπὶς τῇ σωτηρίᾳ τοῦ ζῴου ὑποβέβληται· ἣν εἴ τις ἀφέλοι, τὸ γενόμενον εὐθὺς οἴχεσθαι δεῖ.

55. *Hieronymus Rhodius*

55T1 Ath. 13.82, 604D-F
[vide S. 24T2]

55A1 Hieronym. Rhod. fr. 35 Wehrli
[vide S. 24T1]

56. *Chrysippus*

56A1 Chrysipp. Stoic. fr. 180.14 *SVF*
[vide Ibyc. 8T1]

57. *Aristoteles*

57T1 Demetr. *Eloc.* 157
[praecedit Demetr. G10]
...ὁ Ἀριστοτέλης ἐπὶ τοῦ ἀετοῦ φησιν, ὅτι λιμῷ θνήσκει ἐπικάμπτων τὸ ῥάμφος· πάσχει δὲ αὐτό, ὅτι
ἄνθρωπος ὢν ποτε ἠδίκησεν ξένον.
ὁ μὲν οὖν τῷ κειμένῳ μύθῳ κέχρηται καὶ κοινῷ.
[pergit testimonium]

57T2 Alex. Aphr. *in Mete.* 2.3
τὸν δὴ οὕτως ὑπολαμβάνοντα γίνεσθαί φησι μηδὲν διαφέρον λέγειν τῶν Αἰσωπείων μύθων. καὶ γὰρ ὁ Αἴσωπος τὸν πορθμέα δεδιττόμενος ὡς οὐκ ἀεὶ τὸ ἔργον ἕξοντα, μυθολογεῖ ὡς

πολλῆς οὔσης τῆς θαλάσσης καὶ πάσῃ τῇ γῇ περικεχυμένης ἡ Χάρυβδις ἀναρροφήσασα τὸ μὲν πρῶτον ἀπανάλωσεν αὐτῆς τοσοῦτον, ὡς τὰ ὄρη τῆς γῆς φανερὰ γενέσθαι, τὸ δὲ δεύτερον τὰς νήσους, τὸ δὲ τρίτον ῥοφήσασα παντελῶς τὴν γῆν ξηρὰν ποιήσει.

ἀλλ' ἐκείνῳ μὲν ἥρμοζεν ὀργιζομένῳ πρὸς τὸν πορθμέα διὰ τοῦ τοιούτου μύθου αὐτὸν φοβεῖν·
[sequitur Alex. Aphr. G44]
ὅτι γὰρ ψεῦδος καὶ μυθῶδες τὸ λεγόμενον, ἑξῆς λέγει.

57T3 Olymp. *In Mete.* 1.14, 352a17
...οὐδὲ πάλιν δεῖ ὑπονοεῖν τὸ ἐν τοῖς Αἰσωπείοις μύθοις λεγόμενον. ὁ γὰρ Αἴσωπος εἰσάγει τινὰ στρατιώτην πρός τινα πορθμέα διαλεγόμενον καὶ λέγοντα, ὅτι

πάλαι οὗτος ὁ τόπος θάλαττα ἦν· εἶτα ἡ Χάρυβδις ἀναρροιβδήσασα ἐποίησε τὰς ἀκρωρείας τῶν ὀρῶν· εἶτα δὶς ἀναρροιβδήσασα ἐποίησε καὶ τὰς νήσους, ὡς εἴ γε τρίτον ἀνερροίβδησε, ξηραίνει πάντα τὰ ὧδε.

καὶ περιττὸν ἡμῖν ἐστι τὸ ἐπιτήδευμα, οὐ χρὴ ταῦτα ἐννοεῖν· στρατιώτῃ γὰρ θυμουμένῳ οὐκ ἀπεικὸς ταῦτα ῥηθῆναι, φιλοσόφῳ δὲ μὴ θυμουμένῳ κατὰ τοῦ παντὸς οὐ θεμιτὸν φθορὰν αὐτοῦ μελετᾶν.

57T4 Erasm. *Adag.* 1.5.74 (p. 210C)

Huic Deo [sc. *Momo*] *mos est, ipsum quidem nihil operis edere, sed aliorum Deorum opera curiosis oculis contemplari, & si quid est omissum, aut perperam factum, id summa cum libertate carpere. Nam* Μῶμος *Græce* reprehensionem *sonat. Aristoteles De partibus Animalium libro tertio* [57A2], *meminit hujus, qui*

naturam incusarit, quod bobus cornua in capite ac non in armis potius addiderit, videlicet quo vehementius possint ferire.

Ad quod allusisse videtur Lucianus, cum in secundo Verarum Narrationum libro [cap. 3], *scribit se vidisse boves quosdam, quibus cornua inessent, non in fronte quemadmodum reliquis, sed sub oculis. Idque ita visum esse* Momo.

[sequitur Pl. 49T13]

57F1 Arist. *Mete.* 2.3, 356b13-15

τὸ δὲ νομίζειν ἐλάττω τε γίγνεσθαι τὸ πλῆθος [*sc.* τῆς θαλάττης], ὥσπερ φησὶ Δημόκριτος, καὶ τέλος ὑπολείψειν, τῶν Αἰσώπου μύθων οὐδὲν διαφέρειν ἔοικεν ὁ πεπεισμένος οὕτως· καὶ γὰρ ἐκεῖνος ἐμυθολόγησεν ὡς

δὶς μὲν ἡ Χάρυβδις ἀναρροφήσασα τὸ μὲν πρῶτον τὰ ὄρη ἐποίησεν φανερά, τὸ δὲ δεύτερον τὰς νήσους, τὸ δὲ τελευταῖον ῥοφήσασα ξηρὰν ποιήσει πάμπαν.

ἐκείνῳ μὲν οὖν ἥρμοττεν ὀργιζομένῳ πρὸς τὸν πορθμέα τοιοῦτον εἰπεῖν μῦθον, τοῖς δὲ τὴν ἀλήθειαν ζητοῦσιν ἧττον· δι' ἣν γὰρ αἰτίαν ἔμεινε τὸ πρῶτον, εἴτε διὰ βάρος, ὥσπερ τινὲς καὶ τούτων φασίν (ἐν προχείρῳ γὰρ τούτου τὴν αἰτίαν ἰδεῖν), εἴτε καὶ δι' ἄλλο τι, δῆλον ὅτι διὰ τοῦτο διαμένειν ἀναγκαῖον καὶ τὸν λοιπὸν χρόνον αὐτήν. ἢ γὰρ λεκτέον αὐτοῖς ὅτι οὐδὲ τὸ ἀναχθὲν ὕδωρ ὑπὸ τοῦ ἡλίου ἥξει πάλιν, ἢ εἴπερ τοῦτ' ἔσται, ἀναγκαῖον ἤτοι ἀεὶ ἢ μέχρι οὗπερ ἂν ᾖ τοῦτο ὑπολείπεσθαι τὴν θάλατταν, καὶ πάλιν ἀναχθῆναι ἐκεῖνο πρότερον δεήσει τὸ πότιμον. ὥστε οὐδέποτε ξηρανεῖται·...

57A1 Arist. *HA* 9.32, 619a18-20

Γηράσκουσι δὲ τοῖς ἀετοῖς τὸ ῥύγχος αὐξάνεται τὸ ἄνω γαμψούμενον ἀεὶ μᾶλλον, καὶ τέλος λιμῷ ἀποθνήσκουσιν. Ἐπιλέγεται δέ τις καὶ μῦθος, ὡς τοῦτο πάσχει διότι

ἄνθρωπός ποτ' ὢν ἠδίκησε ξένον.

ἀποτίθεται δὲ τὴν περιττεύουσαν τροφὴν τοῖς νεοττοῖς· διὰ γὰρ τὸ μὴ

εὔπορον εἶναι καθ' ἑκάστην ἡμέραν αὐτὴν πορίζεσθαι, ἐνίοτε οὐκ ἔχουσιν ἔξωθεν κομίζειν.

57A2 Arist. *PA* 3.2, 663a35-663b3

Ὀρθῶς δὲ καὶ τὸ ἐπὶ τῆς κεφαλῆς ποιῆσαι τὴν τῶν κεράτων φύσιν, ἀλλὰ μὴ καθάπερ

ὁ Αἰσώπου Μῶμος διαμέμφεται τὸν ταῦρον, ὅτι οὐκ ἐπὶ τοῖς ὤμοις ἔχει τὰ κέρατα, ὅθεν τὰς πληγὰς ἐποιεῖτ' ἂν ἰσχυροτάτας, ἀλλ' ἐπὶ τοῦ ἀσθενεστάτου μέρους τῆς κεφαλῆς. Οὐ γὰρ ὀξὺ βλέπων ὁ Μῶμος ταῦτ' ἐπετίμησεν.

Ὥσπερ γὰρ καὶ εἰ ἑτέρωθί που τοῦ σώματος κέρατα ἐπεφύκει, βάρος 'ν παρεῖχεν ἄλλως οὐδὲν ὄντα χρήσιμα κἂν ἐμπόδια τῶν ἔργων πολλοῖς ἦν, οὕτως καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν ὤμων πεφυκότα. Οὐ γὰρ μόνον χρὴ σκοπεῖν πόθεν ἰσχυρότεραι αἱ πληγαί, ἀλλὰ καὶ πόθεν πορρώτεραι· ὥστ' ἐπεὶ καὶ χεῖρας μὲν οὐκ ἔχουσιν, ἐπὶ δὲ τῶν ποδῶν ἀδύνατον, ἐν δὲ τοῖς γόνασιν ὄντα τὴν κάμψιν ἐκώλυεν ἄν, ἀναγκαῖον ὥσπερ νῦν ἔχουσιν, ἐπὶ τῆς κεφαλῆς ἔχειν. Ἅμα δὲ καὶ πρὸς τὰς ἄλλας κινήσεις τοῦ σώματος ἀνεμπόδιστα πέφυκεν οὕτω μάλιστα.

58. *auctor incertus*

58T1 Demetr. *Eloc.* 158

[praecedit Demetr. G10]

...τις περὶ αἰλούρου λέγων, ὅτι συμφθίνει τῇ σελήνῃ καὶ ὁ αἴλουρος καὶ συμπαχύνεται, προσέπλασεν, ὅτι ἔνθεν καὶ ὁ μῦθός ἐστιν, ὡς

[sequitur auct. inc. 58F/A1]

οὐ γὰρ μόνον κατ' αὐτὴν τὴν πλάσιν ἔσται ἡ χάρις, ἀλλὰ καὶ ὁ μῦθος ἐμφαίνει χαριέν τι, αἰέλουρον ποιῶν σελήνης παῖδα.

58F/A1 auct. inc. *ap.* Demetr. *Eloc.* 158

[praecedit auct. inc. 58T1]

ἡ σελήνη ἔτεκεν τὸν αἴλουρον·

[pergit testimonium]

59. *Aristarchus*

59T1 Σ (Procl. ?) *in* Hes. *Op.* 207-212

[praecedit Hes. 2T1]

[sequitur Aristarch. 59A1]

59T2 Tz. *in* Hes. *Op.* 200

[praecedit Hes. 2T31a]

Καὶ οὕτως, οὐδὲ ὁ παρὰ Πρόκλῳ Ἀρίσταρχος σχεῖ χώραν ὀβελίζειν τοὺς δύο στίχους τούτους, τὸ ἐπιμύθιον. Ἀκούσατε δὲ ὦ Πρόκλε τε καὶ Ἀρίσταρχε, κἂν περ ἡμεῖς τοῦτο οὐ διορθώσαμεν, οὐ γελοῖον ἦν καθ' ἡμᾶς, τὸ τὰ ἄλογα μὲν καὶ ἀνθρωπίνως λαλεῖν συγχωρεῖν, μὴ μέντοι δὲ γνωμολογεῖν· ἀλλ' ἰστέον, ὅτι ὁ λαλεῖν ἀνθρωπίνως εἰδώς, καὶ γνωμολογήσει θελήσας, καὶ ᾧ τινι συγκεχώρηται τὸ λαλεῖν, καὶ τὸ γνωμολογεῖν δηλονότι συγχωρηθήσεται. Ἀλλ' οὐκέτι τὴν ὑμετέραν ἀλαζονείαν ἐλέγχων μακρηγορήσω· παραδραμοῦμαι δέ, τοῦτο μόνον ἀποφαινόμενος, ὅτι κακῶς λέγετε. Ὑμῖν δὲ τοῖς ἀκροωμένοις φημί, ὅτι ἐν τῷ ῥηθέντι νῦν χωρίῳ τῶν ἔπων οὐκ ἔδει πολυλογίας, λέξεων δὲ βραχειῶν τινῶν. Καὶ γέγραφα ταύτας ἄνωθεν τῶν ἔπων.

[pergit testimonium]

59A1 Aristarch. *in* Hes. *Op.* 210-211, fr. 7 Waeschke

[praecedit Aristarch. 59T1]

τούτων δὲ τῶν στίχων ὁ Ἀρίσταρχος ὀβελίζει τοὺς τελευταίους ὡς ἀλόγῳ γνωμολογεῖν οὐκ ἂν προσῆκον.

60. *Crates Pergamenus*

60T1 Ael. *NA* 17.37

[vide Stesich. 7T2, 7T4]

60F/A1 Crates Perg. *ap.* Ael. *NA* 17.37

[= 60T1]

61. *Trypho (I)*

61A1 Trypho (I), *Trop.* 24

[vide Call. 20T1]

CONSPECTUS EDITIONUM[1]

A.		West, M.L., *Aeschyli tragoediae*, Stuttgart: Teubner 1990
	fr.	Radt S., *TragGrF* III, 1985
	epigr.	Beckby
Abst.		Neveletus 1610
Achae.		Snell, B., *TragGrF* I, 1971
A.D.		Schneider, R., *Gr.Gr.* 2.1, 1878
Ael.		Hercher, R., *Claudii Aeliani de natura animalium libri XVII, varia historia, epistolae, fragmenta*, I-II, Leipzig: Teubner 1864-1866 (repr. Graz: Akademische Druck- und Verlagsanstalt 1971)
Agath.		Beckby
Alcmaeon Crot.		Diels-Kranz I
Alex. Aphr.		Hayduck, M., *Alexandri Aphrodisiensis in Aristotelis meteorologicorum libros commentaria* (*CAG* 3.2), 1899
anon. *in* Arist. *Rh.*		Rabe, H., *Anonymi et Stephani in artem rhetoricam commentaria*, 1896 (*CAG* 21.2)
anon. gramm.		*An. Ox.* IV
anon. *in Aphth.*		Walz II
anon. *Prol. Phil. Pl.*		Westerink, L.G., *Anonymous. Prolegomena to Platonic Philosophy*, Amsterdam: North-Holland Publishing Company 1962
anon. *Περὶ αἴνου*		Bartoletti, V., *PSI* 11, 1935, 154 (no. 1221)
Antip. Sid.		Gow-Page 1965
Antipho Soph.		Diels-Kranz II
Antisth.		Caizzi, F., *Antisthenis fragmenta*, Milan: Istituto Editoriale Cisalpino 1966
Aphth.		Rabe 1926
Apollon.		Bekker, I., *Apollonii Sophistae lexicon Homericum*, Berlin: Reimer 1833 (repr. Hildesheim: Olms 1967)
Apolloph.		*PCG*
Apostol.		Leutsch-Schneidewin II
Ar.		Coulon, V.-Daele, M. van, *Aristophane*, I-V, Budé, 1923-1930 (repr. 1963-1969 (1st ed. corr.))
	V.	MacDowell 1971
Arch. Antioch.		Gow-Page 1968
Archil.		West I
Arch. Mytil.		Gow-Page 1968
Arist.	*HA*	Louis, P., *Aristote. Histoire des animaux*, I-III, Budé, 1964-1969

[1] Berkowitz, L.-Squitier, K.A.-Johnson, W.A., *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae. Canon of Greek Authors and Works*, New York/Oxford: Oxford UP, 1990[3], has been extremely useful in compiling this list.

	Mete.	Fobes, F.H., *Aristotelis meteorologicorum libri quattuor*, I-II, Oxford: Clarendon P 1924 (repr. 1970 [of 1953 corr. ed.])
	PA	Louis, P., *Aristote. Les parties des animaux*, Budé, 1956
	Pol.	Ross, W.D., *Aristotelis politica*, Oxford: Clarendon P 1957 (repr. 1964)
	Rh.	Ross, W.D., *Aristotelis ars rhetorica*, Oxford: Clarendon P 1959 (repr. 1964)
	fr.	Rose, V., *Aristotelis qui ferebantur librorum fragmenta*, Leipzig: Teubner 1886 (repr. Stuttgart 1967)
Aristarch.		Waeschke
Aristias		Snell B., *TragGrF* I, 1971
Aristid.	*Or.* 1-16	Lenz, F.W.-Behr, C.A., *P. Aelii Aristidis opera quae exstant omnia*, I.1-4, Leiden: Brill 1976-1980
	Or. 17-53	Keil, B., *Aelii Aristidis Smyrnaei quae supersunt omnia*, II, Berlin 1898 (repr. 1958)
Arist. Lat.		Schneider, B., *Aristoteles Latinus*, XXXI.1-2. *Rhetorica*, Leiden: Brill 1978
Aristobul.		*FGrH* 139
Arsen.		Leutsch-Schneidewin II
Ath.		Kaibel, G., *Athenaei Naucratitae deipnosophistarum libri XV*, I-III, Leipzig: Teubner 1887-1890 (repr. Stuttgart 1965-1966)
Atticus		Des Places, E., *Atticus. Fragments*, Budé, 1977
Auct. ad Her.		Calboli, G., *Rhetorica ad C. Herennium*, Bologna: Pàtron 1969
Aug.	*c. mend. ad Consent.*	Péronne-Écalle-Vincent-Charpentier, *Œuvres complètes de Saint Augustin*, XXII, Paris 1870
	Cons. Evang.	id., VIII, 1871
Aus.		Green, R.P.H., *The Works of Ausonius*, Oxford: Clarendon P 1991
Avian.		Gaide, F., *Avianus. Fables*, Budé, 1980
Babr.		Perry 1965 (cf. Luzzatto, M.J.-La Penna, A., *Babrii mythiambi Aesopei*, Leipzig: Teubner 1986)
Barb.		Cocco, C., *Ermolao Barbaro il Vecchio. Aesopi fabulae*, FLMU VI, 1994
Bas.	*Leg. lib. gent.*	Boulenger, F., *Saint Basile. Aux jeunes gens sur la manière de tirer profit des lettres Helléniques*, Budé, 1935 (repr. 1965)
	Virt.	*MPG* 32
Bocc.		Reedy, J., *Boccaccio In Defence of Poetry. Genealogiae deorum gentilium liber XIV. Edited from University of Chicago MS. 100*, Toronto 1978
Call.		Pfeiffer
Cerc.		Lomiento, L., *Cercidas. Testimonia et fragmenta*, Roma: Gruppo Editoriale Internazionale 1993
Chamael.		Giordano, D., *Chamaeleontis Heracleotae fragmenta*, Bologna: Pàtron 1990[2)]
Choer.		Hilgard A., *Gr.Gr.* 4.1-2, 1894
	epimer. in Ps.	Gaisford, Th., *Georgii Choeroboscі Dictata in Theodosii Canones necnon Epimerismi in Psalmos*, Oxford 1842, III

Chrysipp. Stoic.		Arnim, J. von, *Stoicorum veterum fragmenta*, II, Leipzig: Teubner 1903 (repr. Stuttgart 1968)
Cic.	*Att.*	Shackleton Bailey, D.R., *Cicero's Letters to Atticus*, III, Cambridge: UP 1968
	Inv.	Stroebel, E., *M. Tulli Ciceronis scripta quae manserunt omnia*, 2: *Rhetorici libri duo qui vocantur de inventione*, Stuttgart: Teubner 1965 (1915)
	De or.	Wilkins, A.S., *M. Tulli Ciceronis Rhetorica*, I, Oxford: Clarendon P 1902
	Tusc.	Pohlenz, M., *M. Tulli Ciceronis scripta quae manserunt omnia*, 44: *Tusculanae disputationes*, Stuttgart: Teubner 1967 (1918)
Clem. Al.		Stählin, O.-Früchtel, L.-Treu, U., *Clemens Alexandrinus*, II$^{3)}$-III$^{2)}$ (*GCS* 52 (15)) 1960-1970
Conon		*FGrH* 26
Conr. Hirs.		Huygens, R.B.C., *Conrad de Hirsau. Dialogus super Auctores*, Berchem-Bruxelles: Latomus 1955
D.	fr.	Baiter, J.-Sauppe, H., *Oratores Attici*, Zürich: Hoehr 1850 (repr. Hildesheim: Olms 1967)
Dati		Tacke 1912[2]
D.Chr.		Arnim, J. von, *Dionis Prusaensis quem vocant Chrysostomum quae exstant omnia*, I-II, Berlin: Weidmann 1893-1896 (repr. 1962)
Demad.		Falco, V. de, *Demade oratore. Testimonianze e frammenti*, Napoli: Libreria Scientifica Editrice 1955$^{2)}$
<Demetr.>		Radermacher, L., *Demetrii Phalerei qui dicitur de elocutione libellus*, Leipzig: Teubner 1901 (repr. Stuttgart 1967)
Democr.		Diels-Kranz II
DH	*Dem.*	Usener, H.-Radermacher, L., *Dionysii Halicarnasei quae exstant*, V-VI, Leipzig: Teubner 1899-1929 (repr. Stuttgart 1965)
Dieg.		Pfeiffer
Dinol.		Kaibel, G., *Comicorum Graecorum fragmenta*, I.1, Berlin: Weidmann 1899
<Diogenian.>		Leutsch-Schneidewin I-II
D.L.		Long, H.S., *Diogenis Laertii vitae philosophorum*, I-II, Oxford: Clarendon P 1964 (repr. 1966)
Doxap. *Comm. in* Aphth.		Walz II
D.S.	1-20	Vogel, F.-Fischer, K.T. (post Bekker, I & Dindorf, L.), *Diodori Bibliotheca historica*, I-V, Leipzig: Teubner 1888-1906$^{3)}$ (repr. Stuttgart 1964)
	21-40	Walton, F.R., *Diodorus of Sicily*, XI-XII, Loeb, 1957-1967 (repr. XI: 1968)
EM		Gaisford, T., *Etymologicum magnum*, Oxford: UP 1848 (repr. Amsterdam: Hakkert 1967)
		Lasserre-Livadaras
Epim. Hom.		*An. Ox.* I

[2] Variant readings from MS Laur. plut. 90 sup. 90 are published by Berrigan 1982.

Erasm.	*Adag.*	*Desiderii Erasmi Roterodami opera omnia*, II, Leiden: Van der Aa 1703
	Cop.	Knott, B I., *De copia verborum ac rerum*, Amsterdam...: North-Holland 1988 (*Opera omnia* 1.6)
Erot.		Nachmanson, E., *Erotiani vocum Hippocraticarum collectio cum fragmentis*, Goteborg: Eranos 1918
Et. Gen.		Lasserre-Livadaras
Et. Gud.		Stefani, E.A. de, *Etymologicum Gudianum quod vocatur*, I, *Litteras* A-B *continens*, II: *Litteras* B-Z *continens* Leipzig: Teubner 1909-1920 (repr. Amsterdam: Hakkert 1965)
Et. Sym.		Lasserre-Livadaras
Eun.	*Hist.*	Dindorf, L., *Historici Graeci minores*, I, Leipzig: Teubner 1870
Eus.		Mras, K., *Eusebius Werke*, VIII: *Die Praeparatio evangelica* (*GCS* 43.1-2), 1954-1956
Eust.	*in* Il.	Valk, M. van der, *Eustathii archiepiscopi Thessalonicensis commentarii ad Homeri Iliadem pertinentes*, I-IV, Leiden: Brill 1971-1987
	in Od.	Stallbaum, G., *Eustathii archiepiscopi Thessalonicensis commentarii ad Homeri Odysseam*, I-II, Leipzig: Weigel 1825-1826 (repr. Hildesheim: Olms 1970)
Eust. Antioch.		Klostermann, E., *Origenes, Eustathius von Antiochien und Gregor von Nyssa uber die Hexe von Endor*, Bonn: Marcus/Weber 1912
Eutecn.		Gualandri, I., *Eutecnii paraphrasis in Nicandri theriaca*, Milano: Istituto Editoriale Cisalpino 1968
fab. aes.		Hausrath (cf. Chambry; Perry 1952)
Fortun.		Halm
Gal.	*Plac. Hipp. et Pl.*	Lacy, P. de, *Galen. On the doctrines of Hippocrates and Plato*, Berlin: Akademie-Verlag 1978
	Simp. med. temp.	Kühn, C G., *Claudii Galeni opera omnia*, XI-XII, Leipzig: Knobloch 1826 (repr. Hildesheim; Olms 1965)
Gell.		Marshall, P.K., *A. Gellii Noctes Atticae*, I-II, Oxford 1968
Greg. Cor.		Schaefer, G.H., *Gregorius Corinthius et alii de dialectis linguae Graecae*, Leipzig: Weigel 1811 (repr. Hildesheim/New York: Olms 1970)
Greg. Cypr.		Leutsch-Schneidewin II
Hdn.		Lentz, A., *Gr.Gr.* 3.1-2, 1867-1870
[Hdn.] *Philet.*		Dain, A., *Le 'Philétaeros' attribué à Hérodien*, Budé, 1954
Hdt.		Legrand, Ph.-E., *Hérodote. Histoire*, I-IX, Budé, 1932-1954 (repr. 1963-1970)
Herenn. Ph.		Palmieri, V., *Herennius Philo. De diversis verborum significationibus*, Napoli: D'Auria 1988
Herm.		Couvreur, P., *Hermeias von Alexandrien. In Platonis Phaedrum scholia*, Paris: Bouillon 1901 (repr. Hildesheim: Olms 1971)
Hermog.		Rabe, H., *Hermogenis opera*, Leipzig: Teubner 1913 (repr. Stuttgart 1969)
Hes.		West 1978a

Hieronym. Rhod.		Wehrli, F., *Hieronymos von Rhodos. Kritolaos und seine Schuler*, Basel: Schwabe 1969[2]
Him.		Colonna, A., *Himerii declamationes et orationes cum deperditarum fragmentis*, Roma: Polygraphica 1951
Hsch.	A-O	Latte, K., *Hesychii Alexandrini lexicon*, I-II, København: Munksgaard 1953-1966
	Π-Ω	Schmidt, M., *Hesychii Alexandrini lexicon*, III-IV, Halle 1861-1862 (repr. Amsterdam: Hakkert 1965)
Hypoth. Isoc.		Matthieu, G.-Brémond, É., *Isocrate. Discours*, Budé, 1963[3]
Iamb.		Dillon, J M., *Iamblichi Chalcidensis in Platonis dialogos commentariorum fragmenta*, Leiden: Brill 1973
Ibyc.		*PMG*
Isid.		Lindsay, W.M., *Isidori Hispalensis Episcopi Etymologiarum sive Originum libri XX*, I-II, Oxford: Clarendon P 1911
Iul. Vict.		Halm
Jo. Sard. *in* Aphth.		Rabe, H., *Ioannis Sardiani Commentarium in Aphthonii progymnasmata*, Leipzig: Teubner 1928
Jul.		Bidez, J -Rochefort, G., *L'empereur Julien. Oeuvres complètes*, I-II, Budé, 1932-1963
lemm.		Waltz, P., *et al.*, *Anthologie Grecque*, I: *Anthologie Palatine*, III-IV, VII, Budé, 1957, 1960
Leon.		Gow-Page 1965
Liv.		Conway, R.S.-Walters, C.F., *Titi Livi Ab urbe condita*, I, Oxford: Clarendon P, 1914
Luc.	*VH*	MacLeod, M.D., *Luciani opera*, I, Oxford: Clarendon P 1972
Luc. Tarrh.		Linnenkugel, A , *De Lucillo Tarrhaeo epigrammatum poeta, grammatico, rhetore*, Paderborn: Schoeningh 1926
Macar.		Leutsch-Schneidewin II
Macr.		Willis, L., *Ambrosii Theodosii Macrobii Commentarii in Somnium Scipionis*, Leipzig: Teubner 1963
Mantiss. prov.		Leutsch-Schneidewin II
Mart. Cap.		Halm
Mar. Victor.		Halm
Max. Tyr.		Trapp, M.B., *Maximus Tyrius. Dissertationes*, Stuttgart/Leipzig: Teubner 1994
Melanchthon	*Util. fab.*	Bretschneider, C.G., *Corpus Reformatorum*, XI: *Philippus Melanchthon. Opera quae supersunt omnia*, Halle/Saale: Schwetschke 1843
Men. Prot.		Muller, C., *Fragmenta Historicorum Graecorum*, IV, Paris: Didot 1885
Moschop.		Gaisford
Nic.		Gow, A.S.F.-Scholfield, A.F., *Nicander. The poems and poetical fragments*, Cambridge: Cambridge UP 1953 (repr.: Salem, New Hampshire: Ayer 1988)
Nicol.		Felten, J., *Nicolai progymnasmata*, Leipzig: Teubner 1913
Olymp.	*in Mete.*	Stuve, G., *Olympiodori in Aristotelis meteora commentaria* (*CAG* 12.2), 1900
	in Alc.	Westerink, L.G., *Olympiodorus. Commentary on the first Alcibiades of Plato*, Amsterdam: Hakkert 1956 (repr. 1982)

	in Grg.	Westerink, L.G., *Olympiodori in Platonis Gorgiam commentaria*, Leipzig: Teubner 1970
Ph.		Cohn, L.-Wendland, P.-Reiter, S., *Philonis Alexandrini opera quae supersunt*, I-VI, Berlin. Reimer 1896-1915 (repr. De Gruyter 1962)
Phaedo		Rossetti 1980
Phaedr.		Perry 1965
Philist.		*FGrH* 556
Philostr. (II/III)		Kayser, C.L., *Flavii Philostrati opera*, I-II, Leipzig: Teubner 1870-1871 (repr. Hildesheim: Olms 1964)
Phld.		Sudhaus, S., *Philodemi volumina rhetorica*, I-II, Leipzig: Teubner 1892-1896 (repr. Amsterdam: Hakkert 1964)
Phot.	*Bibl.*	Henry, R., *Photius. Bibliothèque*, I-VIII, Budé, 1959-1977
	Lex.	Theodoridis, C., *Photii patriarchae lexicon*, I (A-Δ), Berlin: De Gruyter 1982
		Naber, S.A., *Photius. Lexicon*, Leiden 1864-1865
Pl.		Duke, E.A.-Hicken, W.F.-Nicoll, W.S.M.-Robinson, D.B.-Strachan, J.C.G., *Platonis opera*, I, Oxford: Clarendon P 1995
		Burnet, J., *Platonis opera*, II-V, Oxford: Clarendon P 1901-1907 (repr. 1967-1968)
Plin.	*NH*	Mayhoff, C., *C. Plini Secundi Naturalis Historia. Libri XXXVII*, I-V, Leipzig: Teubner 1892-1909 (repr. Stuttgart 1967)
Plu.	*Alc.*, *Dem.*, *Them.*	Ziegler, K., *Plutarchi vitae parallelae*, 1.1-2, Leipzig: Teubner 1964$^{3)}$-1969$^{4)}$
	Mor.	Babbitt, F.C.-Pearson, L., *Plutarch's moralia*, I-II, XI, Loeb, 1927-1965 (repr. 1962-1970)
[Plu.]		Mau, J., *Plutarchi moralia*, Leipzig: Teubner 1971
PMich. 6		Winter, J.G., "Some Literary Papyri in the University of Michigan Collection", *TAPhA* 53, 1922, 128(136)-141
Prisc.		Halm
Ps.-Ammon.		Nickau, K., *Ammonii qui dicitur liber de adfinium vocabulorum differentia*, Leipzig: Teubner 1966
Psel.	*Orat.*	Littlewood, A.R., *Michaelis Pselli Oratoria Minora*, Leipzig: Teubner 1985
(Ps.-?)Ptol. Ascal.		Heylbut, H., "Ptolemaeus περὶ διαφορᾶς λέξεων", *Hermes* 22, 1887, 388-410
Ps.-Zonar.	*Lex.*	Tittmann, J.A.H., *Iohannae Zonarae Lexicon...*, Leipzig 1808 (repr. Amsterdam: Hakkert 1967)
Quint.		Winterbottom, M., *M. Fabi Quintiliani Institutionis Oratoriae libri duodecim*, I-II, Oxford: Clarendon 1970
Rom.		Thiele, G., *Der Lateinische Äsop des Romulus und die Prosa-Fassungen des Phädrus*, Heidelberg: Winter 1910 (repr. Hildesheim/Zurich/New York: Olms 1985)
		Hervieux II
S.		Dain, A.-Mazon, P., *Sophocle*, I-III, Budé, 1955 (repr. 1967 (1st ed. rev.))
	fr.	Radt, S., *TragGrF* IV, 1977
	1,4-5	West II

	1	*PMG*
Σ *in* Ar.	*Ach.*	Wilson, N.G., *Scholia in Aristophanis Achamenses*, Groningen: Bouma 1975
	Av.	Holwerda, D., *Scholia vetera et recentiora in Aristophanis Aves*, Groningen: Forsten 1991
		Hangard, J., *Scholia in Aristophanis Lysistratam*, Groningen: Forsten 1996
	Pac.	Koster, W.J.W, *Scholia vetera et recentiora in Aristophanis Pacem*, Groningen: Bouma 1982
	Ra.	Dübner, F., *Scholia Graeca in Aristophanem*, Paris: Didot 1877 (repr. Hildesheim: Olms 1969)
	V.	Koster, W.J.W, *Scholia vetera et recentiora in Aristophanis Vespas*, Groningen: Bouma 1978
Σ *in* E.		Schwartz, E., *Scholia in Euripidem*, I-II, Berlin: Reimer 1887-1891 (repr. De Gruyter 1966)
Σ *in* Hes.		Pertusi, A., *Scholia vetera in Hesiodi opera et dies*, Milano: Societa Editrice Vita e Pensiero 1955
Σ *in* Il.		Erbse, H., *Scholia Graeca in Homeri Iliadem (Scholia Vetera)*, I-V, VII, Berlin 1969-1988
		Cramer, J.A., *Anecdota Graeca e codd. manuscriptis bibliothecae Regiae Parisiensis*, III, Oxford 1841 (repr. Hildesheim: Olms 1967)
Σ *in* Luc.		Rabe, H., *Scholia in Lucianum*, Leipzig: Teubner 1906 (repr. Stuttgart 1971)
Σ *in* Nic.		Crugnola, A., *Scholia in Nicandri theriaka*, Milano: Istituto Editoriale Cisalpino 1971
Σ *in* Od.		Dindorf, W., *Scholia Graeca in Homeri Odysseam*, I-II, Oxford: UP 1855 (repr. Amsterdam: Hakkert 1962)
Σ *in* Pl.		Greene, W.C., *Scholia Platonica*, Haverford, Pennsylvania: American Philological Association 1938
Σ *in* S.		Χριστοδούλου, Γ.Α., *Τὰ ἀρχαῖα σχόλια εἰς Αἴαντα τοῦ Σοφοκλέους. Κριτικὴ ἔκδοσις*, Ἀθῆναι 1977
Σ *in* Th.		Hude, K., *Scholia in Thucydidem ad optimos codices collata*, Leipzig: Teubner 1927 (repr. New York: Arno 1973)
Σ *in* Theoc.		Wendel, K., *Scholia in Theocritum vetera*, Leipzig: Teubner 1914 (repr. Stuttgart 1967)
Scol.		*PMG*
Semon.		West II
Sen.	*Polyb. cons.*	Reynolds, L.D., *L. Annaei Senecae Dialogorum libri duodecim*, Oxford: Clarendon 1977
Simon.		West II
Socr.		West II
Sopat.		Rabe 1926
Stesich.		*PMG*
Stob.		Wachsmuth, C.-Hense, O., *Ioannis Stobaei anthologium*, I-V, Berlin: Weidmann 1884-1912 (repr. 1958)
Stratt.		*PCG*
Suda		Adler, A., *Suidae lexicon*, I-IV, Leipzig: Teubner 1928-1935 (repr. Stuttgart 1967-1971)
Suet.	*Rhet.*	Kaster 1995

Symm.		Seeck, O., *Q. Aurelii Symmachi quae supersunt*, Berlin: Weidmann 1883 (repr. 1961)
Syn.	*Ep.*	Hercher, R., *Epistolographi Graeci*, Paris: Didot 1873 (repr. Amsterdam: Hakkert 1965)
	Dion, Insomn.	Terzaghi, N., *Synesii Cyrenensis opuscula*, Roma: Polygraphica 1944
Tat.		Whittaker, M., *Tatian.* Oratio ad Graecos *and Fragments*, Oxford: Clarendon P 1982
Th.		Jones, H.S.-Powell, J.E., *Thucydidis historiae*, I-II, Oxford: Clarendon P 1942 (repr. 1967-1970 (1st/2nd ed. rev.))
Thdr. Stud.	*Ep.*	*MPG* 99
Them.		Schenkl, H.-Downey, G.-Norman, A.F., *Themistii orationes quae supersunt*, I-III, Leipzig: Teubner 1965-1974
Theoc.		Gow, A.S.F., *Theocritus*, I, Cambridge: Cambridge UP 1952[2] (repr. 1965)
Theo Sm.		Hiller, E., *Theonis Smyrnaei philosophi Platonici expositio rerum mathematicarum ad legendum Platonem utilium*, Leipzig: Teubner 1878
Theon		Spengel II[3]
Theopomp. Hist.		*FGrH* 115
Tim.		Hermann, K.F., *Platonis dialogi*, VI, Leipzig: Teubner 1853
Timocr.	7,9,10	West II
	1-6	*PMG*
Tricl.	*in* A. *A.*	Smith, O.L., *Scholia graeca in Aeschylum quae exstant omnia*, I-II, Leipzig: Teubner 1976
	in Ar.	see Σ *in* Ar.
Trypho		Spengel III
Tz.	*in* Ar. *Av*	Koster, W.J.W., *Jo. Tzetzae commentarium in Ranas et in Aves. Argumentum Equitum*, Groningen: Wolters; Amsterdam: Swets&Zeitlinger 1962
	in Ar. *Pl.*	Massa Positano, L., *Jo. Tzetzae commentarii in Aristophanem*, Groningen: Bouma 1960
	in Hes. *Op.*	Gaisford
Val. Max.		Kempf, C., *Valerii Maximi factorum et dictorum memorabilium libri novem*, Stuttgart: Teubner 1966 (repr. 1888[2])
Vit. Aesop.	G	Παπαθωμόπουλος, Μ., *'Ο Βίος τοῦ Αἰσώπου. Ἡ παραλλαγή G*, Ἰωάννινα: Πανεπιστήμιο Ἰωαννίνων 1990[4]
	W	Perry 1952
X.		Marchant, E.C., *Xenophontis opera omnia*, I-V, Oxford: Clarendon P 1900-1920 (repr. 1961-1971)
Zen.		Buhler, W., *Zenobii Athoi Proverbia vulgari ceteraque memoria aucta*, I: *Prolegomena*, Gottingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht 1987; IV: *2, 1-40*, 1982
		Leutsch-Schneidewin I

[3] It has not been possible to use the 1997 Budé edition by Patillon and Bolognesi.
[4] Cf. Van Dijk 1994d.

BIBLIOGRAPHY[1]

ἀρίστης ἠξιώθη βιβλιοθήκης [*sc.* Αἴσωπος] (*Praef. fab. Aes.* (*Aes.* T1))

1. *Fables c.a.*

Aarne, A.-Thompson S., *The Types of the Folktale. A Classification and Bibliography*, Helsinki 1964² (FFC 184);

Achelis, Th. O., "Aesope Tragedian", *ASNS* 131, 1913, 435-437;

id., "Die Fabel Doligami", *RhM* 73, 1920-1924, 102-123;

Adamik, T., "The fables of Aesop in rhetoric", *Homonoia* 4, 1982, 51-68;

Adrados, F.R., *Estudios sobre el léxico de las fábulas esópicas (en torno a los problemas de la koiné literaria)*, Salamanca: Colegio trilingue de la Universidad 1948;

id., "El papiro Rylands 493 y la tradición fabulística antigua", *Emerita* 20, 1952, 337-388;

id., review of Hausrath 1940-1956¹, *Gnomon* 29, 1957, 436;

id., "El tema del águila, de la épica acadia a Esquilo", *Emerita* 32, 1964, 267-282;

id., "El tema del león en el Agamenón de Esquilo (717-49)", *Emerita* 33, 1965(a), 1-5;

id., "El tema del torrente en la literatura griega arcaica y clásica", *Emerita* 33, 1965(b), 7-14;

id., "Elementos cínicos en las 'Vidas' de Esopo y Secundo y en el 'Diálogo' de Alejandro y los gimnosofistas", in: *Homenaje al Eleuterio Elorduy, con ocasión de su 80 aniversario*, ed. Vallas, R., Bilbao: Universidad de Deusto 1978(a), 309-328;

id., "Prolegómenos al estudio de la fábula en época helenística", *Emerita* 46, 1978(b), 1-81;

id., "Desiderata en la investigación de la fábula antigua", in: *Actas del V Congreso Español...* 1978(d), 215-235;

id., *Historia de la fábula greco-latina*, I: *Introducción y de los orígenes a la edad helenística*, Madrid: Editorial de la Universidad Complutense 1979(a); II: *La fábula en época imperial romana y medieval*, ibid. 1985; III: *Inventario y documentación de la fábula greco-latina*, ibid. 1987(a);

id., "La fábula de la golondrina de Grecia a la India y la Edad Media", *Emerita* 48, 1979(b), 185-208;

---

[1] Full titles of some editions (Bartoletti (anon. *Περὶ αἴνου*); Buhler 1987 (Zen.); Coulon-Van Daele (Ar.); De Falco (Demad.); Dillon (Iamb.); Erbse (Σ *in* Il.); Fowler 1936 (Plu.); Gaide (Avian.); Giordano (Chamael.); Gow 1952 (Theoc.); Gow-Scholfield (Nic.); Green (Aus.); Greene (Σ *in* Pl.); Henry (Phot.); Jacoby (*FGrHist*); Koster (Σ *in* Ar. V.); Linnenkugel (Luc. Tarrh.), Lomiento (Cerc.); Luzzatto-La Penna (Babr.); Papathomopoulos 1990 (*Vit. Aesop.*); Rose (Arist. fr.); Thiele 1910 (Rom.); Van der Valk (Eust. *in* Il.); Waltz *et al.* (*lemm.*); Whittaker (Tat.)) are to be found in the *Conspectus editionum* above. It should be noted that it has not been possible to include literature which appeared after January 1997.

id., "Más sobre la fábula de la golondrina", *Emerita* 50, 1982(a), 75-80;

id., "La fábula griega como género literario", in: id. *et al.* (eds.), *Estudios de forma y contenido sobre los géneros literarios griegos*, Cáceres: Universidad de Extremadura 1982(b), 33-46;

id., "Neue jambische Fragmente aus archaischer und klassischer Zeit. Stesichorus, Semonides (?), Auctor Incertus", *Philologus* 126, 1982(c), 157-179 (enl. version of "Nuevos fragmentos de poetas yámbicos arcaicos y clásicos", in: *Unidad y pluralidad en el mundo antiguo. Actas del VI Congreso Español de Estudios Clásicos (Sevilla, 6-11 de abril de 1981)*, II, Madrid: Gredos 1983(a), 55-62;

id., "Siria, cruce de caminos de la narrativa bizantina y la oriental", *Aula Orientalis* 1, 1983(b), 17-29;

id. (ed.), *La Fable*, Genève: Fondation Hardt 1984(a);

id., "Les collections de fables à l'époque hellénistique et romaine", in: Adrados 1984a (b), 137-195;

id., "Las ranas pidiendo rey": origen y evolución de una fábula política", *Emerita* 52, 1984(c), 25-32,

id., "Política cínica en las fábulas esópicas", in: Boldrini *et al.* 1987(b), 413-426;

id., "Ibico 61 y el influjo del *Gilgameš* en Grecia", *Aula Orientalis* 5, 1987(c), 5-9;

id., "Esopo", *Grande Dizionario Enciclopedico*, 7, Torino: Torinese 1988(a)[4], 640;

id., "Sobre el origen de la fábula del águila y el escarabajo (H. 3)", *CFC* 21, 1988(b), 261-266;

id., "Favola", *Grande Dizionario Enciclopedico*, 8, Torino: Torinese 1989[4], 62-63;

id., "Documentación suplementaria de la fábula greco-latina", *Euphrosyne* 18, 1990, 213-226;

id., "De la fábula griega a la fábula latina en dísticos elegíacos", in: Catanzaro, G.-Santucci, F., *La favolistica latina in distici elegiaci. Atti del Convegno internazionale Assisi, 26-28 ottobre 1990*, Assisi 1991(a), 27-43;

id., "Versiones medievales del tema de la serpiente desagradecida", in: *Excerpta philologica Antonio Holgado Redondo sacra*, I.2, 1991(b), 739-746;

id., "La fecha de la Augustana y la tradición fabulística antigua y bizantina", *Prometheus* 18, 1992, 139-149;

id., "Mito y fábula", *Emerita* 61, 1993(b), 1-14;

id., "fable", in. Hornblower, S.-Spawforth, A. (eds.), *The Oxford Classical Dictionary*, Oxford: UP 1996[3], 584-585;

Albini, G., "I due topi in molti poeti", *A&R* 6, 1903, col. 175-180;

Ahrens, H., *Die Fabel vom Lowen und Maus in der Weltliteratur*, Diss. Rostock 1920;

Allen, D.C., "An Explication of Lovelace's 'The Grasse-Hopper'", *Modern Language Quarterly* 18, 1957, 35-43;

Alsina, J., "Elementos esópicos en el cuento popular neogriego", in: *Actas del V Congreso Español*... 1978, 237-241;

Aly, W., *Volksmarchen, Sage und Novelle bei Herodot und seinen Zeitgenossen. Eine Untersuchung uber die volkstumlichen Elemente der altgriechischen Prosaerzählung*, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht 1921;

id., "Märchen", *RE* 14.1, Stuttgart 1928, col. 254-281;

Anger, A., "Herders Fabeltheorien", in: Hasubek 1982, 134-145;

Archibald, H.T., "The Fable in Archilochus, Herodotus, Livy, and Horace", *TAPhA* 33, 1902, pp. LXXXVIII-XC;

id., "The Fable in Horace", *TAPhA* 41, 1910, pp. XIV-XIX;

id., *The Fable as a Stylistic Test in Classical Greek Literature*, Baltimore: Furst 1912;

Arendt, D., "Der Fuchs in der Fabel von Asop bis Goethe", *Neue Deutsche Hefte* 29, 1982, 486-500;

Arnheim, M.T.W., "The World of the Fable", *Studies in Antiquity* 1.1, 1979/1980, 1-11;

Austin, H.D., "The Origin and Greek Versions of the Strange-Feathers Fable", in: *Studies in Honor of A. Marshall Elliott*, Baltimore: Johns Hopkins P; Paris: Champion; Leipzig: Harrassowitz, *s.a.*, I, 305-327;

Bádenas de la Peña, P.-Martínez Díez, A.-Martínez-Fresneda, E.-Rodríguez Monescilla, E. (eds.), *Athlon: Satura grammatica in honorem Francisci R. Adrados*, II, Madrid: Gredos 1987;

Baker, H., " A Portrait of Aesop", *Sewanee Review* 77, 1969, 557-590;

Baldi, A., "Tracce del mito di Etana in Archiloco ed Esopo", *Aevum* 35, 1961, 381-384;

Bauer, G., "Der Bürger als Schaf und als Scherer Sozialkritik, politisches Bewußtsein und ökonomische Lage in Lessings Fabeln"; in: Hasubek 1983a, 260-297 (originally appeared in: *Euphorion* 1973, 24-51);

Beavis, M.A., "Parable and Fable", *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 52, 1990, 473-498;

Bédier, J., *Les Fabliaux. Etudes de littérature populaire et d'histoire littéraire du Moyen Age*, Paris: Champion 1964[6];

Benfey, Th., *Pantschatantra. Funf Bucher indischer Fabeln, Marchen und Erzahlungen*, I-II, Leipzig 1859 (repr. Hildesheim: Olms 1966);

Bentley, R., *Dissertations upon the Epistles of Phalaris, Themistocles, Socrates, Euripides, and upon the Fables of Æsop*, 1699 (quoted from ed. Dyce, A., London: MacPherson 1836 (repr. Hildesheim: New York: Olms 1971), II 222-237);

Bergerfurth, W., "'Des fables fait on les fabliaus'. Zum Verhältnis von Fabel und Fablel", in: id. *et al.* [Hrsgg.], *Festschrift für Rupprecht Rohr zum 60. Geburtstag*, Heidelberg: Groos 1979, 61-73,

Berrigan, J.R., "The Latin Aesop of the Early Quattrocento: The Metrical Apologues of Leonardo Dati", *Manuscripta* 26, 1982, 15-23;

Bertini, F., FLM, I, 1984;

Bertschinger, J., *Volkstumliche Elemente in der Sprache des Phaedrus*, Diss. Bern: Läderach& Kastli 1921;

Bewick, T., *The fables of Aesop and others*, Newcastle: Walker 1818, pp. III-XVI (repr. New York/London: Paddington 1975);

Bianciotto, G.-Salvat, M. (eds.), *Épopée animale, fable, fabliau. Actes du IVe Colloque de la Société Internationale Renardienne, Evreux, 7-11 septembre 1981*, Paris: PUF 1984;

Bideaux, M., *et al.* (eds.), *Fables et fabulistes. Variations autour de La Fontaine*, Mont-de-Marsan: Editions InterUniversitaires 1992;

Bieber, D., *Studien zur Geschichte der Fabel in den ersten Jahrhunderten der Kaiserzeit*, Berlin 1906 (Diss. Munchen 1905);

Von Bissing, F.W., "Eudoxos von Knidos Aufenthalt in Agypten und seine Übertragung ägyptischer Tierfabeln", *Forschungen und Fortschritte* 25, 1949, 225-230;

Blackham, H.J., *The Fable as Literature*, London/Dover: Athlone P 1985;

Blavier-Paquot, S., "La concepción de la fábula en La Fontaine", *Revista de Literatura* 26 (51-52), 1964, 97-108;

Bodson, L., "Le renard et le hérisson (Archiloque, fr. 201 West)", in: Servais, J.-Hackens, T.-Servais-Soyez, B. (ed.), *STEMMATA. Mélanges de philologie, d'histoire et*

d'archéologie grecques offerts à Labarbe, J., Suppl. *AC*, Liège/Louvain-la Neuve 1987, 55-59;

Boissonade, J F., *Babrii fabulae iambicae CXXIII*, Paris: Didot 1844;

Bolte, J.-Polívka, G., *Anmerkungen zu den Kinder- und Hausmarchen der Bruder Grimm*, Berlin 1912-1932 (repr. Hildesheim: Olms 19632); [in part also separately published: Bolte, *Name und Merkmale des Marchens*, Helsinki 1920 (FFC 36); id., *Zeugnisse zur Geschichte der Marchen*, Greifswald: Bamberg 1921 (FFC 39))]

Bonnafé, A., "Le rossignol et la justice en pleurs (Hésiode, "Travaux", 203-212)", *BAGB* 1983, 260-264;

Borthwick, E.K., "Beetle, bell, goldfinch, and weasel in Aristophanes' *Peace*", *CR* 82 (*n.s.* 18), 1968, 134-139;

Bowra, C.M., "The Fox and the Hedgehog", *CQ* 34, 1940, 26-29;

Briegel-Florig, W., *Geschichte der Fabelforschung in Deutschland*, Diss. Freiburg im Breisgau 1965;

Brockelmann, C., "Fabel und Tiermarchen in der älteren arabischen Literatur", *Islamica* 2, 1926, 96-128;

Brummack, J., "Herders Theorie der Fabel", in: Sauder, G. [Hrsg.], *Johann Gottfried Herder 1744-1803*, Hamburg: Meiner 1987, 251-266;

Brunner, Chr.J., "The Fable of *The Babylonian Tree*, I: Introduction", *JNES* 39, 1980, 191-202, "II: Translation", ib. 291-302;

Brunner-Traut, E., "Agyptische Tiermarchen", *ZÄS* 80, 1955, 12-32;

ead., *Altagyptische Tiergeschichte und Fabel. Gestalt und Stahlkraft*, Darmstadt 1974[4] (first appeared in: *Saeculum* 10, 1959, 124-185);

Buchheit, V., "Tierfriede in der Antike", *WJA n.s.* 12, 1986, 143-167;

Buchholtz, H., "Die Fabel vom Affen und Fuchs bei Archilochos", *RhM n.s.* 28, 1873, 176-179;

Burger, K., "Epilogische Volkswitze in den Fabelsammlungen", *Hermes* 27, 1892, 359-362;

Burges, G., "In Pseudo-Babriana nuperrime reperta notulae", *RPh* 1, 1845, 454-463;

id., "Notularum in Pseudo-Babriana appendicula", *RPh* 2, 1847, 225-235;

Cameron, A., "Macrobius, Avienus, and Avianus", *CQ n.s.* 17 (59), 1967, 385-399;

Canter, H.V., "The Figure ΑΔΥΝΑΤΟΝ in Greek and Latin Poetry", *AJPh* 51, 1930, 32-41;

Capizzi, A., "Un apologo di Alcmeone crotoniate?", *QUCC n.s.* 13, 1983, 159-163;

Caratello, U., "Marziale, Canio Rufo e Fedro", *GIF* 7, 1964, 122-148;

Carlson, G.I., S.J., "Horace's and Today's Town and Country Mice", *Bestia* 4, 1992, 87-112;

id., "Fables Invite Perception", *Bestia* 5, 1993, 7-26;

id., *Aesop. A Fable Collection*, Washington, D.C. 1994[7];

Carnes, P., *Fable Scholarship. An Annotated Bibliography*, New York/London 1985;

id., "Heinrich Steinhowel and the Sixteenth-Century Fable Tradition", *Humanistica Lovaniensia* 35, 1986, 1-29;

id. (ed.), *Proverbia in Fabula. Essays on the Relationship of the Proverb and the Fable*, Bern/Frankfurt am Main/New York/Paris: Lang 1988;

id., "The Fable and the Anti-Fable: The Modern Faces of Aesop", *Bestia* 4, 1992, 5-33;

Cascajero, J., "Lucha de clases e ideología: introducción al estudio de la fábula esópica como fuente histórica", *Gerión* 9, 1991, 11-58;

id., "Lucha de clases e ideología: aproximación temática a las fábulas no contenidas en las colecciones anónimas", *Gerión* 10, 1992, 23-63;

Cataudella, Q., "Aristofane e il cosiddetto 'Romanzo di Esopo'", *Dioniso* 20, 1942, 5-14;

Chambry, E., "Notice sur Ésope et les fables ésopiques", in: id. (ed.), *Fables*, Budé, 1960², pp. IX-LIV;

Christes, J., "Reflexe erlebter Unfreiheit in den Sentenzen des Publilius Syrus und den Fabeln des Phaedrus. Zur Problematik ihrer Verifizierung", *Hermes* 107, 1979, 199-220;

Christoffersson, H., *Studia de fabulis Babrianis*, Diss. Lund: Moller 1901;

Coats, G.W., "Parable, Fable, and Anecdote. Storytelling in the Succession Narrative", *Interpretation* 35, 1981, 368-387;

Coenen, H.G., "Zur Deutbarkeit von Fabeln", *Linguistische Berichte* 41, 1976, 15-21;

Collinet, J.-P., "La Fable néo-latine avant et après La Fontaine", in: Tuynman, P.-Kuiper, G.C.-Keßler, E. (eds.), *Acta Conventus neo-latini amstelodamensis. Proceedings of the Second International Congress of Neo-Latin Studies, Amsterdam, 19-24 August 1973*, München: Fink 1979, 244-257;

Colson, F.H., "Phaedrus and Quintilian I.9.2. A Reply to Professor Postgate", *CR* 33, 1919, 59-61;

Compton, T., "The Trial of the Satirist: Poetic *Vitae* (Aesop, Archilochus, Homer) as Background for Plato's *Apology*", *AJPh* 111, 1990, 330-347;

Corbato, C., "La funzione delle 'fabulae' in Callimaco", in: *La struttura della fabulazione antica*, Genova 1979, 45-64;

Costás Rodríguez, J., "La terminología latina de la fábula", in: Melena, J.L. (ed.), *Symbolae Ludovico Mitxelena septuagenario oblatae*, I, *Veleia*, Anejo I, Vitoria 1985, 287-294;

Crusius, O., "De Babrii aetate", *Leipziger Studien zur classischen Philologie* 2, 1879, 125-248;

id., "studien zu Babrios und den Aisopeia", *Jahrbücher für classische Philologie* 29, 1883, 225-249;

id., "Märchenreminiszenzen im antiken Sprichwort", *Verhandlungen der vierzigsten Versammlung deutscher Philologen und Schulmänner*, Leipzig: Teubner 1890, 31-47;

id., "Ainos" (10), *RE* 1.1, Stuttgart 1893, col. 1029-1030;

id., "Über eine alte Thierfabel", *RhM* 49, 1894(a), 299-308;

id., "Nachtrag uber den Begriff *apologus*", *Philologus* 52 (*n.s.* 6), 1894(b), 533-535;

id., "Theopomp bei Babrius", *Philologus* 54 (*n.s.* 8), 1895(a), 745;

id., "Apologos", *RE* 2.1, Stuttgart 1895(b), col. 167-170;

id., "Babrios", *RE* 2.2, Stuttgart 1896, col. 2655-2667;

id., "Aus der Geschichte der Fabel", in: Kleukens, C.H. (ed.), *Das Buch der Fabeln*, Leipzig 1913, pp. I-LXIII;

id., "Ein verschollener Mythus", in: *Aufsatze zur Kultur- und Sprachgeschichte vornehmlich des Orients Ernst Kuhn zum 70. Geburtstage am 7. Februar 1916 gewidmet...*, Breslau: Marcus 1916, 388-399;

Currie, H.MacL., "Phaedrus the Fabulist", *ANRW* 2.32.1, 1984, 497-513;

Dahnhardt, O., *Natursagen. Ein Samlung naturdeutender Sagen, Marchen, Fabeln und Legenden*, IV: *Tiersagen*, 2, Leipzig/Berlin: Teubner 1912;

Dalfen, J., "Die Fabel in der griechischen Literatur", *Janus* 11, 1990, 56-62;

id., "Die ὕβρις der Nachtigall. Zu der Fabel bei Hesiod (Erga 202-218) und zur griechischen Fabel im allgemeinen", *WS* 107/108, 1994/1995, 157-177;

Daly, L.W., *Aesop without Morals. The famous Fables, and a Life of Aesop*, New York/London: Yoseloff 1961(a);
id., "Hesiod's Fable", *TAPhA* 92, 1961(b), 45-51;
Dandrey, P., *La fabrique des* Fables. *Essai sur la poétique de La Fontaine*, Paris: Klincksieck 1992[2];
Dareste, R., "Études sur l'Antiquité. Babrius et la Fable grecque", *Revue des deux mondes* 1846.2, 80-98;
Davies, M., "Aeschylus and the Fable", *Hermes* 109, 1981, 248-251;
id., "The ancient Greeks on why mankind does not live forever", *MH* 44, 1987, 65-75;
id.-Kathirithamby, J., *Greek Insects*, London: Duckworth 1986;
Dawson, W.R., "The Mouse in Fable and Folklore", *Folk-lore* 36, 1925, 227-248;
Delhay, C., "Achille Tatius fabuliste?", *Pallas* 36, 1990, 117-131;
Della Corte, F., "Orazio favolista", *Cultura e Scuola* , 25.100, 1986, 87-93;
Demandt, A., "Politik in den Fabeln Aesops", *Gymnasium* 98, 1991, 397-419;
Denis, J., "De la fable dans l'antiquité classique", *Mémoires de l'Académie des sciences, arts et belles-lettres de Caen* 1883, 227-305;
Derendorf, B., *Der Magdeburger Prosa-Äsop*, Köln/Weimar/Wien: Böhlau 1996;
Dicke, G.-Grubmüller, K., *Die Fabeln des Mittelalters und der frühen Neuzeit. Ein Katalog der deutschen Versionen und ihrer lateinischen Entsprechungen*, München: Fink 1987;
Diels, H., "Orientalische Fabeln in griechischem Gewande", *Internationale Wochenschrift für Wissenschaft, Kunst und Technik* 4, 1910, col. 993-1002;
Dierauer, U., *Tier und Mensch im Denken der Antike. Studien zur Tierpsychologie, Anthropologie und Ethik*, Amsterdam: Grüner 1977;
Diez, E.-Bauer, J.B., "Fuchs", *Jahrbuch für Antike und Christentum* 16, 1973, 168-178;
Van Dijk, J.G.M., "De theorie van de fabel in de Griekse Oudheid", in: Idema-Schipper-Schrijvers 1993(a), 22-36;
id., "Fables in Ancient Historiography", *Bestia* 5, 1993(b), 27-42;
id., "Intertextualiteit in de Griekse literatuur. De functie van een fabel van Aeschylus tot Eustathius", *Kleio* 22, 1993(c), 141-157;
id., "Theory and Terminology of the Greek Fable", *Reinardus* 6, 1993(d), 171-183;
id., "*Addenda ad Aesopica.* Unnoticed and Neglected Themes and Variations of Greek and Latin Fables", *Bestia* 6, 1994(a), 95-117;
id., notes to id. 1993b, *Bestia* 6, 1994(b), 118-135;
id., review of Holzberg 1992, *Mnemosyne* 47, 1994(c), 384-389;
id., review of Papathomopoulos 1989-1990, *Mnemosyne* 47, 1994(d), 550-555;
id., "The Lion and the He-Goat. A New Fable in Procopius", *Hermes* 122, 1994(e), 376-379;
id., "Ἐκ τῶν μύθων ἄρξασθαι. Greek Fable Theory after Aristotle: Characters and Characteristics", in: Abbenes-Slings-Sluiter 1995(a), 235-258;
id., "The Fables in the Greek *Life of Aesop*", *Reinardus* 8, 1995(b), 131-150;
id., "The Function of Fables in Graeco-Roman Romance", *Mnemosyne* 49, 1996(a), 513-541;
id., "The (Pseudo-)Ignatius Tetrastichs: Byzantine Fables 'D'une élégance laconique'", *Reinardus* 9, 1996(b), 161-178;
id., "Over Aisopos en het genre van de fabel", in: Van Dolen, H.L.-Fiedeldij Dop, J. (transl.), *Aisopos. Fabels*, Nijmegen: SUN 1997, 95-111;
id., review of Holzberg 1993, *Mnemosyne* (forthcoming);

Dithmar, R. [Hrsg.], *Fabeln, Parabeln und Gleichnisse. Beispiele didaktischer Literatur*, Nördlingen 1972²;
id., *Die Fabel. Geschichte. Struktur. Didaktik*, Paderborn: Schöningh 1971 (repr. 1984);
id. [Hrsg.], *Texte zur Theorie der Fabeln, Parabeln und Gleichnisse*, Nördlingen 1982;
id., "Fabel", *EM* 4, 1984, col. 727-745;
Doderer, K., *Fabeln. Formen. Figuren. Lehren*, Zürich/Freiburg im Breisgau: Atlantis Verlag 1970;
Dodsley, R., *An Essay on Fable*, Birmingham: Baskerville 1764 (Los Angeles: Augustan Reprint Society 1965);
Donzelli, G., "Una versione menippea della Αἰσώπου πρᾶσις?", *RFIC n.s.* 38 (88), 1960, 225-276;
Dressel, J.P.R., "Zur Geschichte der Fabel, I: Die aesopische Fabel bei den Griechen", in: *Jahresbericht uber die vereinigten Anstalten: das Königl. Friedrich-Wilhelms-Gymnasium, die Königl. Realschule, Vorschule und Elisabethschule zu Berlin...*, Berlin 1876;
Drogan, G., *De Babrii mythiambis*, Berlin: Hayn 1847;
Duchemin, J., "Contribution à l'histoire de la fable ésopique", *REG* 83, 1970, pp. XIX-XX = *REL* 48, 1970, 10-11;
Dumont, J., "La religion d' Ésope", *Pallas* 35, 1989, 7-24;
Easterling, P.E., "The Fable", in: Easterling-Knox 1989(a), I.4, 139-143;
Eichner, S., *Die Prosafabel Lessings in seiner Theorie und Dichtung. Ein Beitrag zur Ästhetik des 18. Jahrhunderts*, Bonn: Bouvier 1974;
Elm, Th.-Hasubek, P. (eds.), *Fabel und Parabel. Kulturgeschichtliche Prozesse im 18. Jahrhundert*, Munchen: Fink 1994;
Elschenbroich, A., "Sammeln und Umgestalten aesopischer Fabeln bei den Neulateinern des 16. Jahrhunderts", *Daphnis* 14, 1985, 1-63;
id., "Das 'byspel' als Handlungselement: Erzählerische Funktion der Fabel in der Fuchsepik", *Jahrbuch des Freien Deutschen Hochstifts* 1986, 1-33;
Enenkel, K.A.E., "Tussen lering en vermaak. De Latijnse fabel in het humanisme", in: Idema-Schipper-Schrijvers 1993, 37-46;
Espino, M.S.A., *Esopo. Fábulas escogidas. Introducción y comentario*, Madrid: Instituto "Antonio de Nebrija" 1942;
Ewald, D., *Die moderne französische Fabel. Struktur und Geschichte*, Diss. Münster 1975;
Ewbank, J.B., *Fable and Proverb in Aristophanes*, diss. U of North-Carolina 1980;
Fabricius, J.A., *Bibliotheca Graeca sive Notitia scriptorum veterum Graecorum...*, Hamburg: Liebezeit & Felginer 1718³, I 390-406: "De Aesopo et aliis fabularum scriptoribus" (repr. in: De Furia 1810, pp. XLI-CXXXVI);
Falkowitz, R.S., "Discrimination and Condensation of Sacred Categories: The Fable in Early Mesopotamian Literature", in: Adrados 1984a, 1-32;
Finch, C.E., "Aesopica in Codex Pal. Lat. 1378", *TAPhA* 108, 1978, 55-67;
Fiocchi, L., "La tartaruga volante in Babrio e in Aviano", *GIF n.s.* 13 (34), 1982, 253-266;
Fischer, A(lbert)., *Kritische Darstellung der Lessingschen Lehre von der Fabel*, Diss. Halle 1891;
Fischer, A(dolf)., *Das Verhältnis der Fabeln des Phädrus zur äsopischen Fabelsammlung*, Program Klosterneuburg 1905;
Fisher, B.F., *A History of the Use of Aesop's Fables as a School Text from the Classical Era through the Nineteenth Century*, diss. Indiana U 1987;
De Florian, J.-P.C., "De la fable", in: *Fables*, 1792 (quoted from ed. Étoile-sur-Rhône: Gauvin 1991, 5-16);

De La Fontaine, J., "Préface", "Vie d'Ésope", in: *Fables*, Paris: Barbin 1668 (quoted from ed. Giraudoux, J.-Lupin, J., Paris: Gallimard 1964, 33-55);

Ford, G B., "An Interpretation of the Fable of the Hawk and Nightingale in Hesiod's "Works and Days"", *Orpheus* 12, 1965, 3-9;

Fraenkel, E., "Zur Form der αἶνοι", *RhM* 73, 1920, 366-370 (repr. in: id., *Kleine Beiträge zur klassischen Philologie*, I, Roma 1964, 235-239);

Freytag, W., "Die Fabel als Allegorie. Zur poetologischen Begriffssprache der Fabeltheorie von der Spätantike bis ins 18. Jahrhundert", *MLatJb* 20, 1985, 66-102 (I); 21, 1986, 3-33 (II);

Friederici, H., "Die Tierfabel als operatives Genre", *Weimarer Beiträge* 11, 1965, 930-952;

Fruchtel, L., "Zur Äsopfabel des Kallimachos", *Gymnasium* 57, 1950, 123-124;

Fuchs, M., *Die Fabel von der Krähe, die sich mit fremden Federn schmückt, betrachtet in ihren verschiedenen Gestaltungen in der abendländischen Literatur*, Diss. Berlin (publ: Schade) 1886;

De Furia, F. (ed.), *Fabulae Aesopicae quales ante Planudem ferebantur...*, Leipzig: Weigel 1810;

Fusci, G.G., *Babrio. Le sue favole e il loro rapporto con le esopiane e con quelle di Fedro e di Aviano*, Modica: Carlo Papa 1901;

Galli, R., *The First Humanistic Translations of Aesop*, diss. Urbana, IL 1978;

Garbugino, G., "La favola del leone ammalato e della volpe nel mondo classico e medievale", in: Bertini 1984, 35-56;

García Gual, C., "El prestigio del zorro", *Emerita* 38, 1970, 417-431;

id., "Sobre πιθηκίζω. 'hacer el mono'", *Emerita* 40, 1972, 453-460;

id., "La fábula esópica: estructura e ideología de un género popular", in: *Estudios ofrecidos a Emilio Alarcos Llorach*, I, Oviedo: Universidad 1977 (repr. in (and quoted from) 1995, 119-135);

id., "Introducción general: acerca de las fábulas griegas como género literario", in: Bádenas de la Peña, P.-López Facal, J., *Fábulas de Esopo. Vida de Esopo. Fábulas de Babrio. Introducciones, traducciones y notas*, Madrid: Gredos 1978(a), 7-26 (repr in (and quoted from): *Figuras helénicas y géneros literarios*, Madrid: Biblioteca Mondadori 1991, 158-170);

id., "Historia y ética de la fábula esópica", in: *Actas del V Congreso Español...*, Madrid 1978(b), 179-208;

id., "Esopo en Plutarco", in: García Valdés, M., *Estudios sobre Plutarco: ideas religiosas. Actas del III Simposio Internacional sobre Plutarco. Oviedo 30 de abril a 2 de mayo de 1992, Sociedad Española de Plutarquistas*, Madrid: Ediciones Clásicas 1994, 605-614;

id., *El zorro y el cuervo. Diez versiones de una famosa fábula*, Madrid: Alianza 1995;

García Iglesias, L., "Los niños en las fábulas de Esopo", *CFC* 20 (*Homenaje al Profesor Lisardo Rubio Fernández*, I), 1986-1987, 249-258;

Garzya, A., *Teognide. Elegie*, Firenze: Sansoni 1958;

Гаспаров, М.Л. "Сюжет и идеология в эзоповских баснях", *VDI* 3(105), 1968, 116-127;

Gebhard, W., "Zum Mißverhaltnis zwischen der Fabel und ihrer Theorie", in: Hasubek 1983a, 298-336 (originally appeared in: *DVjs* 48, 1974, 122-153;

Gellert, Chr. F., *De poesi apologorum eorumque scriptoribus*, Leipzig: Breitkopf 1744, in: *Schriften zur Theorie und Geschichte der Fabel. Historisch-kritische Ausgabe bearbeitet von* Scheibe, S., Tubingen. Niemeyer 1966;

De Gennaro-Ferrigni, A., "Sull'uso dell'apologo nella letteratura latina", *Atti della Reale Accademia Pontaniana* 29.3, 1899;

Getzlaff, E., *Quaestiones Babrianae et Pseudo-Dositheanae*, Diss. Marburg 1907;

Gombel, H., *Die Fabel "Vom Magen und den Gliedern" in der Weltliteratur (mit besonderer Berucksichtigung der romanischen Fabelliteratur)*, Halle (Saale): Niemeyer 1934;

Goossens, J.-Sodmann, T. (eds.), *Third International Beast Epic, Fable and Fabliau Colloquium, Munster 1979: Proceedings*. Koln/Wien: Bohlau 1981;

Gordon, E.I., "A New Look at the Wisdom of Sumer and Akkad", *BO* 17, 1960, 122-152;

Gottfried, B., "Pan, The Cicadas, and Plato's Use of Myth in the *Phaedrus*", in: Press, G.A. (ed.), *Plato's Dialogues. New Studies and Interpretations*, Lanham, Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield 1993, 179-195;

Gow, A.S.F., "The *Gallus* and the Lion. *Anth. Pal.* VI 217-220, 237", *JHS* 80, 1960, 91-92;

Gragg, G., "The Fable of the Heron and the Turtle", *Archiv für Orientforschung* 24, 1973, 51-72;

Grauert, G.H., *De Aesopo et fabulis Aesopicis*, Diss. Bonn: Marcus/Leiden: Luchtmans 1825;

Grawi, E., *Die Fabel vom Baum und dem Schilfrohr in der Weltliteratur*, Diss. Rostock: Leopolds 1911;

Grebel, A., *Darstellung und Kritik von Lessings Fabeltheorie*, Diss. Jena: Ratz 1876;

Grimm, J., *Reinhart Fuchs*, Berlin: Reimer 1834;

Grottanelli, C., "Aesop in Babylon", in: Nissen, H.J.-Renger, J., *Mesopotamien und seine Nachbarn. Politische und kulturelle Wechselbeziehungen im alten Vorderasien vom 4. bis 1. Jahrtausend v. Chr.*, Berlin: Reimer 1987², I 555-572;

Grubmuller, K., *Meister Esopus. Untersuchungen zu Geschichte und Funktion der Fabel im Mittelalter*, Zurich/Munchen: Artemis 1977;

id., "Semantik der Fabel", in: Goossens-Sodmann 1981, 111-134;

id., "Zur Pragmatik der Fabel. Der Situationsbezug als Gattungsmerkmal", in: *Textsorten und literarische Gattungen. Dokumentation des Germanistentages in Hamburg vom 1. bis 4. April 1979*, Berlin: Schmidt 1983, 473-488;

Grumel, V., "Une fable d'Ésope dans Photius. Les trois grappes", *Annuaire de l'Institut de Philologie et d'Histoire Orientales et Slaves* 11, 1951: *Παγκάρπεια. Mélanges Henri Grégoire*, III, 129-132;

Guter, J., "500 Jahre Fabelillustration", *Antiquariat* 1972, 25-31, 41-47, 89-93;

Hale, C.B., *The Text Tradition of the Aesopic Fables Belonging to the So-Called Augustana Recension*, diss. Urbana, IL 1941;

Hale, D.G., "Intestine Sedition: The Fable of the Belly", *CLS* 5, 1968, 377-388;

Hand, W.D.-Arlt, G.O., *Humaniora. Essays in Literature, Folklore and Bibliography Honoring Archer Taylor on his Seventieth Birthday*, Locust Valley, New York: Augustin 1960;

Handford, S.A., *Fables of Aesop*, Melbourne/London/Baltimore: Penguin 1964;

Hanlet, C., "Phèdre, le fabuliste latin", *LEC* 12, 1943, 317-324;

Harth, D., "Christian Wolffs Begrundung des Exempel- und Fabelgebrauchs im Rahmen der Praktischen Philosophie", *DVjs* 52, 1978, 43-62;

Hartman, J.J., *De Phaedri fabulis commentatio*, Leiden 1890;

Hassauer, F., *Die Philosophie der Fabeltiere. Untersuchungen zu Funktions- und Strukturwechsel in der Fabel der franzosischen Aufklarung*, Munchen: Fink 1986;

Hasubek, P. [Hrsg.], *Die Fabel. Theorie, Geschichte und Rezeption einer Gattung*, Berlin: Schmidt 1982;

id. [Hrsg.], *Fabelforschung*, Darmstadt 1983(a);

id., "Erkenntnis und Vergnugen — Fabeldefinitionen", in: Bodemann, U., *Fabula docet. Illustrierte Fabelbucher aus sechs Jahrhunderten*, Wolfenbuttel: Herzog August Bibliothek 1983(b), 9-19;

id., "Fabel", in: Ueding 3, 1996, col. 185-198;

Hausrath, A., "Untersuchungen zur Überlieferung der äsopischen Fabeln", *Jahrbucher für classischen Philologie* Suppl. 21, 1894, 245-312;

id., "Das Problem der Asopischen Fabel", *NJbb* 1, 1898, 305-322;

id., "Die Asopstudien des Maximus Planudes", *ByzZ* 10, 1901, 91-105;

id., "Fabel", *RE* 6.2, Stuttgart 1909, col. 1704-1736;

id., "Achiqar und Aesop. Das Verhältnis der orientalischen zur griechischen Fabeldichtung", *SHAW*, Heidelberg: Winter 1918, 2. Abh.;

id., "Zur Arbeitsweise des Phaedrus", *Hermes* 71, 1936, 70-103;

id., "Phaedrus", *RE* 19.2, Stuttgart 1938, col. 1475-1505;

id., *Aesopische Fabeln... Gefolgt von einer Abhandlung: Die Aesoplegende*, Munchen: Heimeran 1944[3];

id., "Ζεὺς καὶ τὰ θηρία. Die unbekannte Asopfabel im Iambenbuch des Kallimachos", *Gymnasium* 56, 1949, 48-58;

id.-Marx A., *Griechische Marchen. Marchen, Fabeln, Schwanke und Novellen aus dem klassischen Altertum...*, Jena: Diederichs 1922[2];

Heijbroek, J.F., *De fabel. Ontwikkeling van een literatuursoort in Nederland en in Vlaanderen*, diss. Amsterdam: Paris 1941;

Heimgartner, G., *Die Eigenart Theokrits in seinem Sprichwort*, Diss. Freiburg in der Schweiz: Paulusdruckerei 1940;

Herrmann, L., "Esquisse d'une histoire des fables à Rome", *Phoibos* 2, 1947/1948, 63-75;

id., *Phèdre et ses fables*, Leiden: Brill 1950;

id., *Avianus. Œuvres...*, Bruxelles 1968 (Collection Latomus 96);

id., "Notes sur le texte d'Avianus", *Latomus* 28, 1969, 669-680;

id., "Les fables Phédriennes de Iulius Titianus", *Latomus* 30, 1971, 678-686;

id., *Babrius et ses poèmes*, Bruxelles 1973 (Collection Latomus 135);

Hertzberg, W., *Babrios Fabeln ubersetzt in deutschen Choliamben. Nebst einer Abhandlung uber den Begriff der Fabel und ihre historische Entwichelung bei den Griechen*, Halle: Lippert und Schmidt 1846;

Hippe, R., *Die Fabel*, Hollfeld: Bange 1981;

Hirsch, S.W., "Cyrus' Parable of the Fish: Sea-Power in the Early Relations of Greece and Persia", *CJ* 81, 1985, 222-229;

Hoch, F.W., *De Babrii fabulis quae in codice Athoo leguntur corruptis atque interpolatis*, Diss. Halle: Ploetz 1870;

Hoefmans, M., "De speech van Menenius Agrippa, Livius, AUC II,32,8-12", *Kleio* 22, 1992-1993, 23-35;

Hohmann, E., *De indole atque auctoritate epimythiorum Babrianorum*, Diss. Königsberg: Hartung 1907;

Holbek, B., *Æsops levned og fabler: Christiern Pedersens oversættelse af Stainhowels Æsop*, I-II, København: Schultz 1961-1962;

id., "Äsop", *EM* 1, 1977, col. 882-889;

Holzberg, N., "Die Fabel von Stadtmaus und Landmaus bei Phaedrus und Horaz", *WJA n.s.* 17, 1991, 229-239;

id. [Hrsg.], unter Mitarbeit von Beschorner, A.-Merkle, S., *Der Äsop-Roman. Motivgeschichte und Erzählstruktur*, Tübingen: Narr 1992;

id., *Die antike Fabel. Eine Einführung*, Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft 1993;

Houdar de La Motte, A., "Discours sur la Fable", in: *Fables nouvelles*, Paris: Dupuis 1719 (quoted from *Fables Choisies de l'Abbé Aubert et de Lamothe Houdart*, Paris 1828, 55-109);

Hower, C.C., *Studies on the So-Called Accursiana Recension of the Life and Fables of Aesop*, diss. Urbana, IL 1936;

Hubbard, Th.K., "Hesiod's Fable of the Hawk and the Nightingale Reconsidered", *GRBS* 36, 1995, 161-171;

Hueck, M., *Textstruktur und Gattungssystem. Studien zum Verhältnis von Emblem und Fabel im 16. u. 17. Jahrhundert*, Kronberg: Scriptor 1975;

Hunger, H., "Die Schildkröte im 'Himmel' (Stephanites und Ichnelates I 40, S. 184 Sjöberg)", *WS* 79, 1966, 260-263;

Huschke, I.G., *Dissertatio de fabulis Archilochi*, in: De Furia 1810, pp. CCIV-CCL;

Idema, W.L.-Schipper, M.-Schrijvers, P.H. (eds.), *Mijn naam is haas. Dierenverhalen in verschillende culturen*, Baarn: Ambo 1993;

Immisch, O., "Über eine alte Pflanzenfabel", *Philologus* 51, 1892, 560;

id., "Babriana", *RhM* 79, 1930, 153-169;

id., "Ein Epodos des Archilochos", *SHAW* 21, 1930/1931, 3. Abh.;

Van Imschoot, P., "Le Règne d'Abimélek (Jud. 9)", *Collationes Gandavenses* 22, 1935, 3-13;

Irmscher, J. [Hrsg.], *Antike Fabeln...*, Berlin/Weimar: Aufbau-Verlag 1987;

Isebaert, L., "La fascination du monde et des Muses selon Platon. À propos de deux mythes du *Phèdre* (258d-259d et 274c-275b)", *LEC* 53, 1985, 205-219;

id., "Le rossignol et l'épervier (Hésiode, *Travaux* 202-213)", *LEC* 56, 1988, 369-377;

Jacob, O., "Le rat de ville et le rat des champs", *LEC* 4, 1935, 130-154;

Jacobs, J., *The fables of Aesop as first printed by William Caxton in 1484 with those of Avian, Alfonso and Poggio...*, I: *History of the Aesopic fable*, London: Nutt 1889 (repr. New York: Burt Franklin 1970);

id., *The Fables of Æsop*, London/New York: MacMillan 1894;

Janssens, J., *La fable et les fabulistes*, Bruxelles: Office de Publicité 1955;

Jedrkiewicz, S., "Platone e le favole esopiche", *Prospettive Settanta n.s.* 5, 1983, 250-264;

id., review of Adrados 1984a, *QUCC n.s.* 24, 1986, 145-155;

id., "La favola esopica nel processo di argomentazione orale fino al IV sec. a.C.", *QUCC n.s.* 27 (56), 1987, 35-63;

id., *Sapere e paradosso nell'Antichità: Esopo e la favola*, Roma: Ateneo 1989;

Jones, W.R., "Avianus, Flavianus, Theodosius, and Macrobius", in: Milligan, B.A.-Frey, J.R.-Kolb, Ph. [eds.], *Classical Studies Presented to Ben Edwin Perry by his Students and Colleagues at the University of Illinois, 1924-60*, Urbana/Chicago/London: U of IL P 1969, 203-209;

Josifović, S., "Beiträge zur Geschichte der Aesopischen Fabel", *Godisnjak Filozofskog Fakulteta u Novom Sadu* 6, 1961, 92-116;

id., "Aisopos und die Aisopische Fabel", *RE* Suppl. 14, München: Druckenmüller 1974, col. 15-40;

Jülicher, A., *Die Gleichnisreden Jesu*, I-II, Tübingen: Mohr 1910^2;

Karadagli, T., *Fabel und Ainos. Studien zur griechischen Fabel*, Diss. Königstein: Hain 1981;

Keller, O., "Untersuchungen uber die Geschichte der griechischen Fabel", *NJbb* Suppl. 4, 1861-1867, 307-418;

id., *Die antike Tierwelt*, I-II, Leipzig: Engelmann 1909-1913;

Kemper, J.A.R., "'I shall tell you a pretty tale'. Menenius Agrippa schept orde in de chaos (Livius, *A.U.C.* 2.31.7-32.12)", *Lampas* 29, 1996, 503-527;

Klemm, H.G., "Die Gleichnisauslegung Adolf Julichers im Bannkreis der Fabeltheorie Lessings", *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 60, 1969, 153-174 (repr. in: Harnisch, W. [Hrsg.], *Gleichnisse Jesu*, Darmstadt 1982, 343-368);

Klingender, F., *Animals in art and thought to the end of the Middle Ages*, Cambridge, MA 1971;

Klinger, W., "Dzisiejsza baśń o rybaku i złotej rybce i jej starogreckie korzenie czy źródła", *Eos* 51, 1961, 217-227;

Knapp, F.P., *Das lateinische Tierepos*, Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft 1979;

id., "Von der antiken Fabel zum lateinischen Tierepos des Mittelalters", in: Adrados 1984a, 253-306;

Knauth, K.A., "Fabula Rasa: "Dé/structuration de la fable ésopique", *Discours Social/Social Discourse* 3, 1988(a), 317-342 (adaptation of: "Fabula rasa. Zur Gattungsproblematik der Fabel", in: Nolting-Hauff, I.-Schulze, J. [Hrsgg.], *Das fremde Wort. Studien zum Interdependenz von Texten. Festschrift für Karl Maurer zum 60. Geburtstag*, Amsterdam: Gruner 1988(b), 51-80);

Knöll, P., "Zum Codex Athous und zum ersten Prooemium des Babrios", *WS* 3, 1881, 184-195;

Knox, B.M.W., "The Lion in the House (*Agamemnon* 717-36 [Murray])", *CPh* 47, 1952, 17-25;

Kohler, C.S., *Das Tierleben im Sprichwort der Griechen und Romer...*, Leipzig 1881 (repr. Hildesheim: Olms 1967);

Koep, L., "Fabel", *RAC* 7, Stuttgart: Hiersemann 1969, col. 129-154;

Komornicka, A.M., "Personifikacja Prawdy i Kłamstwa w bajce grecko-rzymskiej", *Meander* 42, 1987, 401-406;

Koopman, H., "Lessing: Das Allgemeine im Besonderen. Aufklarung als Denkfigur und Fabeltheorie", in: Elm-Hasubek 1994, 51-63;

Κουκουλές, Φ.Ι., "Παραμύθια, μῦθοι καὶ εὐτράπελοι διηγήσεις παρὰ Βυζαντινοῖς", Λαογραφία 15, 1953, 219-227 (repr. in: *Βυζαντινῶν βίος καὶ πολιτισμός*, VI, 'Αθῆναι 1955, 326-333;

Kovacs, R.S., *The Aesopic Fable in Ancient Rhetorical Theory and Practice*, diss. Urbana, IL 1950;

Krappe, A.H., *The Science of Folklore*, Paris 1929 (repr. New York: Norton 1964);

Kreis, R.., "Fabel und Tiergleichnis", in: Ide, H. [Hrsg.], *Kritisches Lesen. Marchen. Sage. Fabel. Volksbuch*, Stuttgart 1974, 57-103;

Krispijn, Th.J.H., "Dierenfabels in het oude Mesopotamie", in: Idema-Schipper-Schrijvers 1993, 131-148;

Kuhn, J., "Feldmaus und Stadtmaus", *EM* 4, 1987, col. 1005-1010;

Kuppers, J., *Die Fabel Avians. Studien zu Darstellung und Erzahlweise spatantiker Fabeldichtung*, Diss. Bonn: Habelt 1977;

id., "Zu Eigenart und Rezeptionsgeschichte der antiken Fabeldichtung", in: Könsgen, E. [Hrsg.], *Arbor amoena comis. 25 Jahre Mittellateinisches Seminar in Bonn 1965-1990*, Stuttgart: Steiner 1990, 23-33;

Küster, C.L., *Illustrierte Aesop-Ausgaben des 15. und 16. Jahrhunderts*, I-II, Diss. Hamburg 1970;

Landsberger, J., *Die Fabeln des Sophos. Syrisches Original der griechischen Fabeln des Syntipas in berichtigtem vocalisirtem Texte zum ersten Male vollständig mit einem Glossar herausgegeben nebst literarischen Vorbemerkungen und einer einleitenden Untersuchung über das Vaterland der Fabel*, Posen: Merzbach 1859;

La Penna, A., "La morale della favola esopica come morale delle classi subalterne nell' antichità", *Società* 17, 1961, 459-537;

id., "Il romanzo di Esopo", *Athenaeum n.s.* 40, 1962, 264-314;

id., "Letteratura esopica e letteratura assiro-babilonese", *RFIC s. III*[a], 92, 1964, 24-39;

Lasserre, F., "La fable en Grèce dans la poésie archaïque", in: Adrados 1984a, 61-103;

Leclerc, M.-Chr., "L'épervier et le rossignol d'Hésiode. Une fable à double sens", *REG* 105, 1992, 37-45;

Leibfried, E., "Philosophisches Lehrgedicht und Fabel", *Neues Handbuch der Literaturwissenschaft*, 11 (ed. Hinck, W.), Frankfurt: Athenaion 1974, 75-90;

id., *Fabel*, Stuttgart: Metzler 1982[4];

id., *Fabel*, Bamberg: Buchner 1984 (repr. 1989);

id.-Werle, J.M. [Hrsgg.], *Texte zur Theorie der Fabel*, Stuttgart 1978;

Lenaghan, R.T., *Caxton's Aesop*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP 1967;

id., "Steinhowel's 'Esopus' and Early Humanism", *Monatshefte* 60, 1968, 1-8;

Lens Tuero, J., "La fábula del *león enamorado* en la Biblioteca histórica de Diodoro de Sicilia", *EFG* 1, 1985, 5-9;

Lenz, F.W., "The Monkeys of Archilochus", *AJPh* 66, 1945, 34-49;

Lessing, G.E., *Abhandlungen über die Fabel*, Berlin 1759 (quoted from ed. Rölleke, H., Stuttgart: Reclam 1967 (repr. 1987), 65sqq);

Leutsch, E. von, "Zur thierfabel", *Philologus* 33, 1874(a), 417;

id., "Der αἶνος Κύπριος", *Philologus* 33, 1874(b), 460;

Lewis, J.E., *The English Fable. Aesop and Literary Culture, 1651-1740*, Cambridge: UP 1996;

Liebchen, W., *Die Fabel. Das Vergnügen der Erkenntnis. Fabel. Gleichnis. Parabel. Witz. Mit einer Abhandlung über die Formkriterien dieser Gattung*, Rhön-Grabfeld/Kilianshof 1990;

id., *Die Fabel heute. Realität und Argument. Rhetorische Fabeln. Mit einer Abhandlung über das Fabelschreiben und über die Stilarten der Fabel*, Rhön-Grabfeld/Kilianshof: Fabel-Verlag 1992;

Lilja, S., *Dogs in Ancient Greek Poetry*, Helsinki/Helsingfors 1976;

id., " The Ape in Ancient Comedy", *Arctos* 14, 1980, 31-38;

Lindner, H., *Fabeln der Neuzeit. England, Frankreich, Deutschland...*, München: Fink 1978(a);

id., "Zur französischen Fabeltheorie im 18. Jahrhundert", *Romanistisches Jahrbuch* 39, 1978(b), 115-133;

id., "Von der Gattung der Fabel zur Schreibweise der Parabel? Zur Lage der parabolischen Literatur in der französischen Kultur der Aufklärung", in: Elm-Hasubek 1994, 19-36;

Livrea, E., "L' αἶνος esiodeo", *GIF n.s.* 1.2 (22), 1970, 1-20;

Lockwood, D.P., "De Rinucio Aretino Graecarum Litterarum Interprete", *HSCPh* , 24, 1913, 51-109;

Lomanto, V., "Favola e critica letteraria in Aviano", *RFIC* 110, 1982, 297-308;

Lonsdale, S.H., "Hesiod's Hawk and Nightingale (Op. 202-12). Fable or Omen?", *Hermes* 117, 1989, 403-412;

De Lorenzi, A., *Fedro*, Firenze: La Nuova Italia 1955;

Lorichius, R., *Scholia in Aphth.*, in: Agricola, R.-Catanæus, I.M. (transl.), *Aphthonii Sophistæ progymnasmata*, 1542 (quoted from ed. Frankfurt: Steinmeyer 1619);

Lüthi, M., *Märchen*, Stuttgart: Metzler 1962;

Luria, S., "Der Affe des Archilochos und die Brautwerbung des Hippokleides", *Philologus* 85 (*n.s.* 39), 1930, 1-22;

id., "L' asino nella pelle del leone (Un parallelo fra le favole dell' India e quelle dell' antica Grecia)", *RFIC n.s.* 12 (62), 1934, 447-473;

Luzzatto, M.J., "La cultura letteraria di Babrio", *ASNP s.* III, 5.1, 1975, 17-97;

ead., "La datazione della collectio Augustana di Esopo ed il verso politico delle origini", *JÖB* 33, 1983, 137-177;

ead., "Note su Aviano e sulle raccolte esopiche greco-latine", *Prometheus* 10, 1984, 75-94;

ead., "Plutarco, Socrate e l' Esopo di Delfi", *ICS* 13.2, 1988, 427-445;

Mader, L., *Antike Fabeln...*, Zürich: Artemis 1951 (repr. München 1973);

Mainoldi, C., *L'image du loup et du chien dans la Grèce ancienne d'Homère à Platon*, Paris: Ophrys 1984;

Maly, E. H., "The Jotham Fable-Antimonarchial?", *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 22, 1960, 299-305;

Marc, P., "Die Überlieferung des Äsopromans", *ByzZ* 19, 1910, 383-421;

Marchesi, C., *Fedro e la favola latina*, Firenze: Vallecchi 1923;

Marenghi, G., "I mitiambi di Babrio e la tradizione esopiana", *GIF* 7, 1954, 341-348;

id., "Babrio e la favola romana", *Athenaeum* 33, 1955(a), 233-246;

id., "Questioni di lingua, stile e metrica per una collocazione romana di Babrio", *GIF* 8, 1955(b), 116-130;

Marino, P.A., "A Lion among the Flock", *CB* 51, 1975, 77-78;

Markschies, H.L., "Lessing und die äsopische Fabel", *Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift der Karl-Marx-Universität Leipzig, Gesellschafts- und Sprachwissenschaftliche Reihe* 4, 1954/1955, 129-142 [repr. in: Hasubek 1983a, 129-164];

Martínez Vázquez, R., "Una cosmogonía acuática en una fábula de Esopo", *Habis* 15, 1984, 35-40;

Mayer, A., *Studien zum Äsoproman und zur äsopischen Fabeln im lateinischen Mittelalter*, Würzburg: Richter 1917 (Wissenschaftliche Beilage zum Jahresbericht des Kgl. humanistischen Gymnasiums Lohr 1916-1917);

McDermott, W.C., "The Ape in Greek Literature", *TAPhA* 66, 1935, 165-176;

McMahon, A.L., *The Origin of the Fable and its Development in Classical Literature*, diss. Lincoln, Nebraska 1927;

Megas, G.A., "Some Oral Greek Parallels to Aesop's Fables", in: Hand-Arlt 1960, 195-207;

id., *Τὸ Ἑλληνικὸ Παραμύθι. Ἀναλυτικὸς κατάλογος τύπων καὶ παραλλαγῶν κατὰ τὸ σύστημα Aarne-Thompson (FFC 184)*, I: *Μῦθοι ζώων*, Ἀθῆναι: Ἀκαδημία Ἀθηνῶν 1978;

Menna, F., "La ricerca dell' adiuvante: sulla favoletta esopica dell' allodola (Enn. sat. 21-58 Vahl.[2]; Babr. 88; Avian. 21)", *MD* 10, 1983, 105-132;

Du Méril, É., *Poésies inédites du moyen age, précédées d'une histoire de la fable ésopique*, Paris: Franck 1854;

Merkelbach, R., "Philodem, Anth. Pal. IX 570 und die epilogischen Geschichten", *RhM* 115, 1972, 219-221;

Merkle, S., "Die Fabel von Frosch und Maus. Zur Funktion der λόγοι im Delphi-Teil des Asop-Romans", in: Holzberg 1992, 110-127;

Meuli, K., "Herkunft und Wesen der Fabel. Ein Vortrag", in: Gelzer 1975, 731-756 (first appeared in: *Schweizerisches Archiv für Volkskunde* 50, 1954(a), 65-88);

Michel, P.-Martin, M., *La Fontaine. Fables*, Paris 1969, II (*Livres VII à XII*);

Mignogna, E., "Aesopus bucolicus. Come si 'mette in scena' un miracolo (Vita Aesopi c. 6)", in: Holzberg 1992, 76-84;

Mitchell, P.M., "Aspekte der Fabeltheorie im 18. Jahrhundert vor Lessing", in: Hasubek 1982, 119-133;

Mollendorff, P. von, "Die Fabel von Adler und Mistkäfer im Asoproman", *RhM* 137, 1994, 141-161;

Mombello, G., "Du temps que les bêtes parloient", in: Vitale-Brovarone, A.-Mombello, G. [eds.], *Atti del V Colloquio della International Beast Epic, Fable and Fabliau Society, Torino-St. Vincent, 5-9 settembre 1983*, Alessandria 1987, 173-189;

Moretti, G., "L' uomo e il leone: un motivo favolistico nel viaggio intertestuale", in: Bertini 1984, 71-83;

Morocho Gayo, G., "Introducción", in: *Esopo y Babrio. Antología de fábulas griegas*, León: Universidad, Secretariado de Publicaciones 1994, 15-72;

Mosino, F., "Simonide, Esopo e le mule", *QUCC* 28, 1978, 93-96;

Muller, C.W., "Ennius und Asop", *MH* 33, 1976, 193-218;

Nagy, G., "Mythe et prose en Grèce archaique: l'*aînos*", in Calame, C. [ed.], *Métamorphoses du mythe en Grèce antique*, Genève: Labor et Fides 1988, 229-242;

Nancy, J.-L., "Mundus est Fabula", *MLN* 93, 1978, 635-653;

Nappa, Chr., "*Agamemnon* 717-36: The Parable of the Lion Cub", *Mnemosyne* 47, 1994, 82-87;

Nestle, W., "Die Fabel des Menenius Agrippa", *Klio* 21, 1927, 350-360;

id., "Ein pessimistischer Zug im Prometheusmythos", *Archiv für Religionswissenschaft* 34, 1937, 378-381;

Neubner, F., *Apologi Graeci antiquissimi historia critica*, Diss. Koln: Bachemius 1889;

Neveletus, I.N., *Mythologia Aesopica*, Frankfurt 1610;

Nickisch, R.M.G., "Über die Fabeltheorien des 19. Jahrhunderts und ihr Verhältnis zur Tradition", in: Hasubek 1982, 198-214;

Nøjgaard, M., "Le cerf, le cheval et l'homme. *Etude sur la transmission des fables antiques*", *C&M* 24, 1963, 1-19;

id., *La fable antique*, I: *La fable grecque avant Phèdre*; II: *Les grands fabulistes*, København: Nyt Nordisk Forlag/Arnold Busck 1964-1967;

id., "La moralisation de la fable: d' Ésope à Romulus", in: Adrados 1984a, 225-251 (= "The moralisation of the fable: from Æsop to Romulus", in: Bekker-Nielsen, H., *et al.* (eds.), *Medieval Narrative. Proceedings of the Third International Symposium organized by the Centre for the Study of Vernacular Literature in the Middle Ages, Odense 20-21 November 1978*, Odense: UP 1979, 31-43);

Noel, Th., *Theories of the Fable in the Eighteenth Century*, New York/London: Columbia UP 1975;

Noldeke, Th., "Zum Achiqar", *Abhandlungen der Königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Gottingen, phil.-hist. Kl. n.s.* 14.4, Berlin 1913;

id., "Das Gleichniss vom Aufziehen eines jungen Raubtiers", in: Arnold, T.W.-Nicholson, R.A. (ed.), *A Volume of Oriental Studies Presented to Edward G. Browne...on his*

60th Birthday (7 February 1922), Cambridge: UP 1922 (repr.: Amsterdam: Philo P 1973), 371-382;

Nuchelmans, J., "Fabel", in: id.-Brouwers, J.H. *et al.*, *Woordenboek der Oudheid*, I, Bussum: Romen 1976, col. 1111;

Oberg, E., *Phaedrus. Fabeln*, Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft 1996(a);

id., "Romische Rechtspflege bei Phaedrus", *RhM* 139, 1996(b), 146-165;

Oesterley, H., *Romulus. Die Paraphrasen des Phaedrus und die Aesopische Fabel im Mittelalter*, Berlin: Weidmann 1870;

Önnerfors, A., "Textliches und Sprachliches zu Phaedrus", *Hermes* 115, 1987, 429-453;

Oldaker, W.H., "Greek fables and Babrius", *G&R* 3, 1933/1934, 85-93;

Opelt, I., "Krokodile als Gymnasiarchen — zur Datierung aesopischer Fabeln", *RhM* 125, 1982, 241-251;

Ott, K.A., "Lessing und La Fontaine. Von dem Gebrauche der Tiere in der Fabel", *Germanisch-Romanische Monatsschrift n.s.* 9, 1959, 235-266 [repr. in: Hasubek 1983a, 165-206];

Otto, A., *Die Sprichwörter und sprichwörtlichen Redensarten der Römer*, Leipzig 1890 (repr. Hildesheim: Olms 1964);

Pannwitz, R., "Äsop", *Antaios* 8, 1966-1967, 47-65;

Παπαδημητρίου, I.-Θ., "Αἰσωπικοὶ μῦθοι στὸ Βυζάντιο καὶ τὴ λατινικὴ δύση. Παράδοση, διάδοση καὶ ἐπιβίωση", in: *Αἰσώπεια καὶ Αἰσωπικά*, Ἀθῆνα 1987, 105-125 (rev. and enl. version of "Some Aesopic Fables in Byzantium and the Latin West. Tradition, Diffusion, and Survival", *ICS* 8, 1983, 122-136);

Papathomopoulos, M., *Aesopus revisitatus. Recherches sur le texte des vies ésopiques*, I: *La critique textuelle*, Ἰωάννινα: Πανεπιστήμιο Ἰωαννίνων 1989;

Parussa, G., *Les recueils français de fables ésopiques au XVIIe siècle*, Genève/Paris: Slatkine 1993;

Pascal, J.-N., "Les successeurs de La Fontaine et la poétique de la fable, de La Motte à Florian", in: Bideaux *et al.* 1992, 171-201;

id., *Les successeurs de La Fontaine au siècle des lumières (1715-1815)*, New York...: Lang 1995;

Patterson, A., *Fables of Power. Aesopian Writing and Political History*, Durham/London: Duke UP 1991;

Pawate, C.I., *The Panchatantra and Aesop's Fables. A Study in Genre*, diss. Delhi 1986;

Peil, D., *Der Streit der Glieder mit dem Magen. Studien zur Überlieferungs- und Deutungsgeschichte der Fabel des Menenius Agrippa von der Antike bis ins 20. Jahrhundert*, Frankfurt am Main/Bern/New York: Lang 1985;

id., "*Nemo sibi satis est.* Zur Deutungsgeschichte der Fabel vom Streit der Glieder mit dem Magen", in: Vitale-Brovarone-Mombello, 213-227;

Pérez de Ayala, R., *Fábulas y ciudades*, Barcelona 1985;

Perry, B.E., *Studies in the Text History of the Life and Fables of Aesop*, Haverford, Pennsylvania 1936;

id., "The Origin of the Epimythium", *TAPhA* 71, 1940, 391-419;

id., review of Hausrath (1940), *CPh* 37, 1942, 207-218;

id. (ed.), *Aesopica...*, I: *Greek and Latin Texts*, Urbana, IL: UP 1952 (repr.: New York: Arno P 1980);

id., "An Aesopic Fable in Photius", *ByzZ* 46, 1953, 308-313;

id., "Fable", *Studium Generale* 12, 1959, 17-37; [repr. in: Carnes 1988, 65-116]

id., "Demetrius of Phalerum and the Aesopic Fables", *TAPhA* 93, 1962, 287-346;

id., *Babrius and Phaedrus. Newly Edited and Translated into English, together with an Historical Introduction and a Comprehensive Survey of Greek and Latin Fables in the Aesopic Tradition*, Loeb, 1965 (repr. 1984);
Peters, W.A.M., *Phaedrus. Een studie over persoon, werk en taal van den Romeinschen fabeldichter*, diss. Nijmegen 1946;
Pinnoy, M., "De mythe van de cicaden (Plato, Phaedrus, 258E-259D)", *Kleio* 16, 1986-1987, 107-113;
Plessow, M., *Geschichte der Fabeldichtung in England bis zu John Gay (1726)*, Berlin: Meyer & Muller 1906;
Pleister, W., "Menschenrecht, Tierfabel und Tierphysiognomik", in: id. - Schild, W. [eds.], *Recht und Gerechtigkeit im Spiegel der europaischen Kunst*, Koln: DuMont 1988;
Portella, O.O., "A Fábula", *Revista letras* 32, 1983, 119-138;
Pórtulas, J., "El lobo y el pulpo: vieja moralidad", in: *Actas del V Congreso Español...* 1978, 277-282;
Postgate, J.P., "Phaedrus and Seneca", *CR* 33, 1919, 19-24;
Powell, M., *Fabula docet. Studies in the background and interpretation of Henryson's Morall Fabillis*, Odense: UP 1983;
Priest, J.F., "The Dog in the Manger: In Quest of a Fable", *CJ* 81, 1985, 49-58;
Prinz, K., "Zur Chronologie und Deutung der Fabeln des Phaedrus", *WS* 43, 1922/1923, 62-70;
Provenzo, E.F., *Education and the Aesopic tradition*, diss. Washington U, St. Louis, Missouri 1976;
Puelma, M., "Sänger und Konig: Zum Verständnis von Hesiods Tierfabel", *MH* 29, 1972, 86-109 (repr. with "Addenda" in: Puelma 1995, 25-50);
Pugliarello, M., *Le origini della favolistica classica*, Brescia: Paideia 1973;
Rammelmeyer, A., *Studien zur Geschichte der russischen Fabel des 18. Jahrhunderts*, Leipzig 1939 (repr.: Nendeln/Liechtenstein: Kraus 1968);
Régnier, J., *Apologi Phaedri*, Dijon: Palliot 1643;
Rein, Th.W., *Sprichworter und sprichworterliche Redensarten bei Lucian*, Diss. Tubingen: Laupp 1894;
Rohde, E., "Ein griechisches Märchen", *RhM* 43, 1888, 303-305;
Rooijen-Dijkman, H.W.A. van, "Fabels: tot nut en vermaak", *Hermeneus* 56, 1984, 6-15;
Ross, L., *De fabels van Lokman. Naar het Latijn van Thomas Erpenius*, 's-Gravenhage: Boucher 1964;
Roth, L., "Die mittelalterlichen sammlungen lateinischer thierfabeln", *Philologus* 1, 1846, 523-546;
Rothstein, J.W., "Jotham's Fabel (Jud. 9, 7-15) rhythmisch-kritisch behandelt", *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie und verwandte Gebiete* 26, 1912, 22-29;
Rubin, D.L., *A Pact with Silence. Art and Thought in the* Fables *of Jean de La Fontaine*, Columbus: Ohio State UP 1991;
Ruelle, P., *Les "Apologues" de Guillaume Tardif et les "Facetiae morales" de Laurent Valla*, Genève/Paris: Slatkine 1986;
Rutherford, W.G. (ed.), *Babrius*, London: MacMillan 1883;
Salzmann, E., *Sprichworter und sprichworterliche Redensarten bei Libanios*, Tubingen: Laupp 1910;
Sarkady, J., "Aisopos der Samier. Ein Beitrag zur archaischen Geschichte Samos", *ACD* 4, 1968, 7-12;
Schafer, W., "Die Fabel im Dienst der Spracherziehung", *Deutschunterricht* 7.5, 1955, 69-79;

Schanz, M., "Sokrates als vermeintlicher Dichter. Ein Beitrag zur Erklärung des Phaidon", *Hermes* 29, 1894, 597-603;

Schauer, M.-Merkle, S., "Äsop und Sokrates", in: Holzberg 1992, 85-96;

Schibli, H.S., "Fragments of a weasel and mouse war", *ZPE* 53, 1983, 1-25;

Schipper, M., "Mijn naam is haas. Dierenverhalen in Afrika", in: Idema-Schipper-Schrijvers 1993, 238-245;

Schippers, A., *Middelnederlandse fabels. Studie van het genre, beschrijving van collecties, catalogus van afzonderlijke fabels*, diss. Nijmegen 1995;

Schmalzriedt, E., "Äsop", in: *Exempla historica. Epochen der Weltgeschichte in Biographien*, 3, Frankfurt am Main 1985, 51-64, 166-167;

id., "Aisopos", *Kindlers Neue Literaturlexikon*, 1, München 1988, 184-185;

Schmidt, C., "Esel in der Löwenhaut", *EM* 4, 1987, col. 428-435;

Schmidt, J.-U., "Hesiods Ainos von Habicht und Nachtigall", *W&D* 17, 1983, 55-76;

Schmidt, P.L., "Politisches Argument und moralischer Appell: Zur Historizität der Fabel im frühkaiserzeitlichen Rom", *Deutschunterricht* 31.6, 1979, 74-88;

Schnur, H.C. [Hrsg.], *Fabeln der Antike*, München 1978(a) (Tusculum);

id. [Hrsg.], *Lateinische Fabeln des Mittelalters*, München: Heimeran Verlag 1978(b) (Tusculum);

Schrader, M., *Sprache und Lebenswelt. Fabeltheorien des 18. Jahrhunderts*, Hildesheim/Zürich/New York: Olms 1991;

Schuhl, P.-M., *Études sur la fabulation platonicienne*, Paris: PUF 1947;

Schumacher, M., "Der Biber — ein Asket? Zu einem metaphorischen Motiv aus Fabel und *Physiologus*", *Euphorion* 86, 1992, 347-353;

Schuursma, J.A., "Aeschyli Apologus", *Mnemosyne n.s.* 60, 1933, 179-192;

Schwarzbaum, H., *The Mishle Shu'alim (Fox Fables) of Rabbi Berechiah Ha-Nakdan. A Study in Comparative Folklore and Fable Lore*, Kiron: Institute for Jewish and Arab Folklore Research 1979;

Shapiro, N.R., *The Fabulists French. Verse Fables of Nine Centuries*, Urbana/Chicago 1992;

Shell, S., "Eating Crow: Rousseau on the Fable", *Bestia* 4, 1992, 75-86;

Sicherl, M., "Cuestiones de primacía en la fábula antigua", in: *Actas del V Congreso Español...* 1978, 249-254;

Simon, S., "Horatius és a Fabula Aesopea", *Egyetemes Philologiai Közlöny* 63, 1939, 1-15;

Simon, U., "The Parable of Jotham (Judges IX, 8-15): The Parable, Its Application and Their Narrative Framework", *Tarbiz* 34, 1964, 1-34 [in Hebrew, with an English summary];

Sironić, M., "Esop i grčka basna", *Zbornik naučnih radova Filozofskog fakulteta* 1951, 433-443 (Croatian; transl. as "Aesop and the Greek Fable", by Wilhelm, L.);

Smith, M.E., "The Fable and Kindred Forms", *JEGPh* 14, 1915, 519-529;

Spoerri, Th., "Der Aufstand der Fabel", *Trivium* 1, 1942/1943, 31-63 [repr. in: Hasubek 1983a, 97-128];

Staege, M., *Die Geschichte der deutschen Fabeltheorie*, Bern: Haupt 1929;

Steiner, G., *Aesopic Reminiscences in the Literature of Later Antiquity*, M.A. thesis Urbana, IL 1938;

Sternberger, D., "Figuren der Fabel", in: id. 1950, 7-24 (originally appeared in *Die Frankfurter Zeitung*, 1941);

id., "Über eine Fabel von Lessing", in: id. 1950, 70-92 (originally appeared in *Die Wandlung*, 1943);

id., *Figuren der Fabel. Essays*, Berlin/Frankfurt am Main 1950;
Tacke, O., "Eine bisher unbekannte Äsopübersetzung aus dem 15. Jahrhundert", *Philologus* 67, 1912, 276-301;
Ter-Nedden, G., "Fabeln und Parabeln zwischen Rede und Schrift", in: Elm-Hasubek 1994, 67-107;
Thiel, H. van, "Sprichwörter in Fabeln", *A&A* 17, 1971, 105-118 (repr. in: Carnes 1988, 209-232);
Thiele, G., "Die vorliterarische Fabel der Griechen", *NJbb* 11, 1908, 377-400;
id., "Martial III, 20", *Philologus* 70 (*n.s.* 24), 1911, 539-548;
id., "Zur Libyschen Fabel", *Philologus* 75 (*n.s.* 29), 1918, 227-231;
Thite, G.U., "Indian Fable", in: Adrados 1984a, 33-60;
Thompson, D'Arcy W., *A Glossary of Greek Birds*, Oxford: UP 1936² (repr. Hildesheim: Olms 1966);
id., *Historia Animalium*, Oxford: Clarendon P 1910 (repr. 1956);
id., *A Glossary of Greek Fishes*, Oxford: UP 1947;
Thompson, S., *The Folktale*, New York: Dryden P 1946 (repr. 1951);
id., *Motif Index of Folk-Literature. A Classification of Narrative Elements in Folktales, Ballads, Myths, Fables, Mediaeval Romances, Exempla, Fabliaux, Jest-Books and Local Legends*, I-VI, Copenhagen: Rosenkilde and Bagger, 1955-1958 (rev. and enl. ed. of 1932-1936);
Tiemann, B., *Fabel und Emblem. Gilles Corrozet und die französische Renaissance-Fabel*, München: Fink 1974;
Traversa, A., review of Jedrkiewicz 1989, *Paideia* 46, 1991, 265-267;
Trencsényi-Waldapfel, I., "Eine Aesopische Fabel und ihre orientalischen Parallelen", *AAntHung* 7, 1959, 317-327;
Tyrwhitt, T., *Dissertatio de Babrio fabularum Aesopearum scriptore. Inseruntur fabulae quaedam Aesopeae numquam antehac editae ex Cod. Ms. Bodleiano. Accedunt Babrii fragmenta*, in: De Furia 1810, pp. CLIII-CCIII;
Ulbricht, C., *De animalium nominibus Aesopeis capita tria*, Diss. Marburg: Koch 1908;
Unrein, O., *De Aviani aetate*, Diss. Jena: Neuenhahn 1885;
Ursing, U., *Studien zur griechischen Fabel*, diss. Lund 1930;
Vaio, J., review of Karadagli 1981, *CR* 35, 1985, 397-398;
id., "The First Prologue of Babrius: Lines 14-16", *ICS* 7, 1982, 233-238;
id., "Babrius and the Byzantine Fable", in: Adrados 1984a, 197-224;
id., "Babrius, Pr. 1.17-19", in: Bádenas de la Peña *et al.* 1987, 867-871;
Vandenberghe, B.H., O.P., *Aisopeia*, Brussel: Electa 1950;
Vanstiphout, H.L.J., "The Mesopotamian Debate Poems. A General Presentation (Part I)", *Acta Sumerologica* 12, 1990, 271-318;
Varty, K., "Animal Fable and Fabulous Animal: The Evolution of the Species With Specific Reference to the Foxy Kind", *Bestia* 3, 1991, 5-14;
Vater Solomon, A. M., "Fable", in: Coats, G.W. (ed.), *Saga, Legend, Tale, Novella, Fable. Narrative Forms in Old Testament Literature*, Sheffield: Academic P 1985 (repr. 1989), 114-125;
Ville de Mirmont, H. de la, "Les *Fabulae* de Statorius Victor", *RPh n.s.* 35, 1911, 276-281;
Villemonteix, J., "Le renard dans la tradition grecque", *Pris-Ma* 7, 1991, 147-152;
Villwock, J., "Lessings Fabelwerk und die Methode seiner literarischen Kritik", *DVjs* 60, 1986, 60-87;
Vindt, L., "Basnja kak literaturnyj žanr", *Poetika* 3, Leningrad 1927, 87-101 (Russian; transl. Imendörffer, H., "Die Fabel als literarisches Genre", *Poetica* 9, 1977, 98-115);

Wache, K., "Die Tierfabel in der Weltliteratur", *Zeitschrift für die Österreichischen Gymnasien* 69, 1919/1920, 416-439;

Wackers, P.W.M., "Die Mittelalterliche Tiergeschichte: *Satira* oder *Fabula*", in: Bianciotto-Salvat 1984, 687-699;

id., "Mutorum Animalium Conloquium, or, Why do animals speak?", *Reinardus* 1, 1988, 163-174;

Warmuth, G., *Autobiographische Tierbilder bei Horaz*, Hildesheim/Zurich/New York: Olms/Weidmann 1992;

Weddigen, O., *Das Wesen und die Theorie der Fabel und ihre Hauptvertreter in Deutschland*, Leipzig: Gebhardt & Wilisch 1893;

Weinreich, O., "Χρυσὸν ἀνὴρ εὑρὼν ἔλιπεν βρόχον. Zu antiken Epigrammen und einer Fabel des Syntipas", *Annuaire de l'Institut de Philologie et d'Histoire Orientales et Slaves* 11, 1951: *Παγκάρπεια. Mélanges Henri Grégoire*, III, 417-467;

Welcker, F.G., "Aesop eine Fabel", in: *Kleine Schriften zur Griechischen Literaturgeschichte*, II, Bonn 1845, 228-263;

Werner, J., "Quaestiones Babrianae", Berlin: Calvarius 1892;

West, M.L., "An Unrecognized Fragment of Archilochus?", *ZPE* 32, 1978(b), 1-5;

id., "Archilochus' Fox and Eagle: More Echoes in Later Poetry", *ZPE* 45, 1982, 30-32;

id., "The Ascription of Fables to Aesop in Archaic and Classical Greece", in: Adrados 1984a, 105-136;

Wicher, E.A., "The Parable as a Form of Literature", *TAPhA* 54, 1923, p. XXIX;

Wiechers, A., *Aesop in Delphi*, Meisenheim am Glan: Hain 1961;

Wienert, W., *Die Typen der griechisch-römischen Fabel. Mit einer Einleitung über das Wesen der Fabel*, Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia 1925 (FFC 56);

Wilhelm, L.K., *The Fate of the Fable in Modern Russian Literature*, diss. U of Kansas 1994;

Wilke, Chr H., "Die Fabel als Instrument der Aufklärung. Untersuchung der Leistungsfähigkeit eines literarischen Typus", *Basis* 2, 1971, 71-102,

Williams, F., "Articulate Beasts in Plato and Babrius", *MPhL* 4, 1981, 207-209;

Williams, R.J., "The Literary History of a Mesopotamian Fable", *Phoenix* 10, 1956, 70-77;

Wilsdorf, H., "Der Weise Achikaros bei Demokrit und Theophrast. Eine Kommunikationsfrage", *Philologus* 135, 1991, 191-206;

Winkler, E., "Das Kunstproblem der Tierdichtung, besonders der Tierfabel", in: *Hauptfragen der Romanistik. Festschrift für Philipp August Becker...*, Heidelberg: Winter 1922, 282-306 [repr. (partially) in: Hasubek 1983a, 53-78];

Wissemann, M., "Fabel. Zur Entwicklung der Bezeichnung für eine Literaturgattung", *Fabula* 33, 1992, 1-13;

Wunsche, A., *Die Pflanzenfabel in der Weltliteratur*, Leipzig/Wien: Akademischer Verlag für Kunst und Wissenschaft 1905 (repr. Leipzig: Zentralantiquariat der Deutschen Demokratischen Republik 1974);

Zachariae, Th., *De dictione Babriana*, Diss. Leipzig: Naumann 1875;

Zander, K.M., *De generibus et libris paraphrasium Phaedrianarum*, Lund: Malmström 1897;

id., *Phaedrus Solutus vel Phaedri fabulae novae XXX*, Lund: Gleerup; London: Milford; Oxford: UP; Paris: Champion; Leipzig: Harrassowitz 1921;

Zielinski, Th., "Das Wiesel als Braut", *RhM n.s.* 44, 1889, 156-157;

Zinato, A., "'Possibile' e 'impossibile' nella favola esopica", in: Lanza, D.-Longo, O. (ed.), *Il meraviglioso e il verosimile tra antichità e medioevo*, Firenze: Olschki 1989, 239-248;

Ziolkowski, J.M., "The Form and Spirit of Beast Fable", *Bestia* 2, 1990(a), 4-18;
id., *Talking Animals. Medieval Latin Beast Poetry, 750-1150*, Philadelphia: U of Pennsylvania P 1993;
Zundel, J., "Äsop in Ägypten", *RhM n.s.* 5, 1847, 422-456, 639-640;
Zymner, R., *Uneigentlichkeit. Studien zu Semantik und Geschichte der Parabel*, Paderborn/München/Wien/Zürich 1991 (Diss. Freiburg 1990);

2. *Greek Literature c.a.*[2]

Abbenes, J.G.J.-Slings, S.R.-Sluiter, I. (eds.), *Greek Literary Theory after Aristotle. A Collection of Papers in Honour of D.M. Schenkeveld*, Amsterdam: VU UP 1995;
Actas del V Congreso Español de Estudios Clásicos (Madrid, 20 al 25 de Abril de 1976), Madrid: Sociedad Española de Estudios Clásicos 1978;
Adam, J.-Adam, A.M., *Platonis Protagoras*, Cambridge: UP 1905[2];
Adam, J., *The Republic of Plato*, I: *Books I-V*, Cambridge 1963[2] (= 1902 with an introduction by Rees, D.A.);
Adrados, F.R., "Nueva reconstrucción de los epodos de Arquíloco", *Emerita* 23, 1955, 1-78;
id., "Nouvaux fragments et interprétations d'Archiloque", *RPh n.s.* 30 (82), 1956, 28-36;
id., "Propuestas para una nueva edición e interpretación de Estesícoro", *Emerita* 46, 1978(c), 251-299;
id., *La Democracia ateniense*, Madrid: Alianza 1993[5] (= 1980);
id., *Líricos griegos. Elegíacos y yambógrafos arcaicos (siglos VII-V a.C.)*, I-II, Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas 1990[3];
id., "A Genre of Graeco-Indian Literature: The Erotic Tale", *Annals of the B.O.R. Institute. Amrtamahotsava Suppl.* 74, 1993(a), 125-139;
id., *El cuento erótico griego, latino e indio. Estudio y Antología*, Madrid: Orto 1994;
id., *Sociedad, amor y poesía en la Grecia antigua*, Madrid: Alianza 1995;
Alewell, K., *Über das rhetorische ΠΑΡΑΔΕΙΓΜΑ: Theorie, Beispielsammlungen, Verwendungen in der römischen Literatur der Kaiserzeit*, Diss. Leipzig: Hoffmann 1913;
Alink, M.J., *De Vogels van Aristophanes: een structuuranalyse en interpretatie*, Amsterdam: Gruner 1983;
Altwegg, G., *De Antiphonte qui dicitur sophista quaestionum particula*, I: *De libro Περὶ ὁμονοίας scripto*, Diss. Basel: Gasser 1908;
Archer-Hind, R.D., *The Phaedo of Plato*, London/New York: MacMillan 1894;
Ardizzoni, A., "Considerazioni sulla struttura del libro dei Giambi di Callimaco", in: *Miscellanea di Studi Alessandrini in memoria di Augusto Rostagni*, Torino 1963, 257-262, transl. by Wieter, W. as "Überlegungen zur Struktur des Buches der 'Iamben' von Kallimachos", in: Skiadas, A.D. [Hrsg.], *Kallimachos*, Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft 1975, 167-175;
id., "Riflessioni sul primo Giambo di Callimaco (fr. 191 Pfeiffer)", *GIF n.s.* 11, 1980, 145-155;
Armstrong, A.M., "Timon of Athens—A Legendary Figure?", *G&R* 34, 1987, 7-11;

[2] This section does not—merely to economize space—list books and articles referred to only once, full references of which are given in the respective notes.

Arnhart, L., *Aristotle on Political Reasoning. A Commentary on the 'Rhetoric'*, DeKalb: Northern IL UP 1981;
Arrowsmith, W., "Aristophanes' Birds: The Fantasy Politics of Eros", *Arion n.s.* 1, 1973-1974, 119-167;
Asheri, D.-Antelami, V., *Erodoto. Le Storie*, I, Milano: Mondadori 1988 (repr. 1989);
Avery, H.C., "One Antiphon or two?", *Hermes* 110, 1982, 145-158;
Bal, B.H., *Plato's ascese in de Phaedo*, diss. Weert: Smeets 1950;
Balme, D.M.-Gotthelf, A., *Aristotle. History of Animals Books VII-X*, Loeb, 1991;
Banks, Th.R., "The Ephemeral, the Perennial, and the Structure of Aristophanes; *Wasps*, *CB* 56, 1980, 81-84;
Barigazzi, A., "Note al giambo IV di Callimaco (fr. 194 Pf.)", *Prometheus* 6, 1980, 243-247;
Barker, E., *The Politics of Aristotle*, Oxford; Clarendon P 1948² (repr. 1961);
Barron, J.P.-Easterling, P.E., "Archilochus", in: Easterling-Knox 1989, I 1, 76-87;
Bates, W.N., "The ΚΩΦΟΙ of Sophocles", *AJPh* 55, 1934, 167-174;
Benardete, S., *The Rhetoric of Morality and Philosophy. Plato's* Gorgias *and* Phaedrus, Chicago/London: U of Chicago P 1991;
Bignone, E., *Teocrito. Studio critico*, Bari: Laterza & Figli 1934;
id., *Studi sul pensiero antico*, Napoli 1938 (repr. Roma: L'Erma di Bretschneider 1965);
Bing, P., "The Voice of those who live in the Sea: Empedocles and Callimachus", *ZPE* 41, 1981, 33-36;
id., *The Well-Read Muse. Present and Past in Callimachus and the Hellenistic Poets*, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck&Ruprecht 1988;
Blass, F., *Die Attische Beredsamkeit*, III.2: *Demosthenes' Genossen und Gegner*, Leipzig 1898³ (repr.: Hildesheim/New York 1979);
Bloedow, E.F., "On 'nurturing lions in the State': Alcibiades' Entry on the Political Stage in Athens", *Klio* 73, 1991, 49-65;
Bluck, R.S., *Plato's Phaedo*, London: Routledge & Kegan Paul Limited 1955;
Von Blumenthal, A., *Die Schätzung des Archilochos im Altertume*, Stuttgart: Kohlhammer 1922;
Blundell, M.W., *Helping Friends and Harming Enemies. A Study in Sophocles and Greek Ethics*, Cambridge/New York/New Rochelle/Melbourne/Sydney: Cambridge UP 1989;
Boardman, J., *The Greeks Overseas. The Archaeology of their early Colonies and Trade*, Harmondsworth: Penguin Books ²1973;
Boldrini, S. *et al.* (eds.), *Filologia e forme letterarie. Studi offerti a Francesco della Corte*, I, Urbino 1987;
Bollack, J., *L'Agamemnon d'Eschyle. Le texte et ses interprétations*, 1-2, Lille 1981-1982;
Bompaire, J., *Lucien écrivain. Imitation et création*, Paris: Boccard: 1958;
Bona Quaglia, L., *Gli 'Erga' di Esiodo*, Turino: Giappichelli 1973;
Bornitz, H.-F., *Herodot-Studien. Beiträge zum Verständnis der Einheit des Geschichtswerks*, Berlin: De Gruyter 1968;
Bossi, F., *Studi su Archiloco*, Bari: Adriatica 1990²;
Bowersock, G.W.-Burkert, W.-Putnam, M.J., *Arktouros. Hellenic Studies presented to Bernard M.W. Knox on the occasion of his 65th birthday*, Berlin/New York: De Gruyter 1979;
Bowra, C.M., *Greek Lyric Poetry. From Alcman to Simonides*, Oxford 1961²;
Bradford Welles, C., "Hesiod's Attitude towards Labor", *GRBS* 8, 1967, 5-25;
Brisson, L., *Platon. Les mots et les mythes*, Paris: Maspero 1982;

Broich, U., "Formen der Markierung von Intertextualität", in: id.-Pfister 1985, 31-47;
id.-Pfister, M. [Hrsgg.], *Intertextualitat. Formen, Funktionen, anglistische Fallstudien*, Tubingen: Niemeyer 1985;
Buhler, W., "Archilochos und Kallimachos", in: Reverdin 1964, 225-247;
Bulloch, A.W., "Hellenistic Poetry", in: Easterling-Knox 1989, I 4, 1-81;
Burkert, W., *Die orientalisierende Epoche*, Heidelberg: Winter 1984;
Burnet, J., *Plato's Phaedo*, Oxford: Clarendon P 1911 (repr. 1959);
Burnett, A.P., *Three Archaic Poets. Archilochus, Alcaeus, Sappho*, London 1983;
Burton, R W.B., *Pindar's Pythian Odes. Essays in Interpretation*, Oxford: UP 1962;
id., *The Chorus in Sophocles' Tragedies*, Oxford: Clarendon P 1980;
Butts, J.R., *The 'Progymnasmata' of Theon*, diss. Claremont Graduate School 1987;
Calame, C. (ed.), *Métamorphoses du mythe en Grèce antique*, Genève: Labor et Fides 1988;
Campbell, L., *The Theaetetus of Plato...*, Oxford: UP 1861 (repr. New York: Arno P 1973);
Campbell, D.A., *Greek Lyric Poetry. A Selection of Early Greek Lyric, Elegiac and Iambic Poetry*, London: MacMillan; New York: St Martin's P 1967 (repr. 1976);
id., *The Golden Lyre. The Themes of the Greek Lyric Poets*, London 1983;
id., *Greek Lyric*, I-V, Loeb, 1982-1993;
Cantarella, R., "Dioniso, fra *Baccanti* e *Rane*", in: Heller-Newman 1974, 291-310;
Capizzi, A., *Socrate e i personaggi filosofi di Platone...*, Roma: Ateneo 1970;
Capovilla, G., *Callimaco*, I-II, Roma: 'L'Erma' di Bretschneider 1967;
Carey, C., *A Commentary on Five Odes of Pindar*, Salem, New Hampshire: Ayer 1981;
id., "Archilochus and Lycambes", *CQ* 36, 1986, 60-67;
Carrière, J., *Theognis. Poèmes élégiaques*, diss. Paris: Les Belles Lettres 1948 (Budé);
id., *Théognis de Mégare. Étude sur le recueil élégiaque attribué à ce poète*, *s.l.*: Bardos *s.a.*;
Casevitz M., *Commentaire des 'Oiseaux' d'Aristophane*, Lyon: L'Hermès 1978;
Chambry, E-Diès, A., *La République (I-III)* (*Platon. Œuvres complètes* 6), Budé, 1959;
Chapman, G.A.H., "Some Notes on Dramatic Illusion in Aristophanes", *AJPh* 104, 1983, 1-23;
Chiasson, C.C., "Pseudartabas and his Eunuchs: *Acharnians* 91-122", *CPh* 79, 1984, 131-136;
Christ, G., *Simonidesstudien*, Diss. Freiburg (Schweiz): Paulusdruckerei 1941;
Von Christ, W.-Schmid, W.-Stählin, O., *Geschichte der griechischen Litteratur*, I: *Klassische Periode der griechischen Litteratur*, München: Beck 1912[6];
Chroust, A.-H., *Socrates. Man and Myth. The Two Socratic Apologies of Xenophon*, London: Routledge & Kegan Paul 1957;
Clark, D.L., "The Rise and Fall of Progymnasmata in Sixteenth and Seventeenth Century Grammar Schools", *Speech Monographs* 19, 1952, 259-263;
Classen, C.J. [Hrsg.], *Sophistik*, Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft 1976;
Clayman, D.L., *Callimachus' Iambi*, Leiden: Brill 1980;
ead., "Callimachus' *Iambi* and *Aetia*", *ZPE* 74, 1988, 277-286; ib. 77, 1989, 292;
Collard, C., *Euripides Supplices*, Groningen 1975;
Colonna, A., *Esiodo. Le opere e i giorni*, Milano: Istituto Editoriale Italiano *s.a.*;
Conacher, D.J., *Aeschylus'* Oresteia: *a literary commentary*, Toronto/Buffalo/London: U of Toronto P 1987;
Cook, A., "Dialectic, Irony, and Myth in Plato's *Phaedrus*", *AJPh* 106, 1985, 427-441;
Cope, E.M., *An Introduction to Aristotle's Rhetoric*, London/Cambridge: MacMillan 1867 (repr. Dubuque, Iowa: Reprint Library, *s.a.*);

id., *The Rhetoric of Aristotle with a Commentary. Revised and Edited by* Sandys, J E., I-III, Cambridge: UP 1877;

Coulon, V., "Notes critiques et exégétiques sur Aristophanes, Ménandre et Anacréon", *REG* 44, 1931, 8-33;

Courtney, E., "Callimachus *Iambus* II fr. 192", *ZPE* 74, 1988, 276;

id., *The Fragmentary Latin Poets*, Oxford: Clarendon P 1993;

Couturat, L., *De Platonicis mythis*, diss. Paris: Alcan 1896;

Craik, E.M., "'One for the Pot': Aristophanes' *Birds* and the Anthesteria", *Eranos* 85, 1987, 25-34;

Crane, G., "Tithonus and the Prologue to Callimachus' *Aetia*", *ZPE* 66, 1986, 269-278;

Crönert, W., *Kolotes und Menedemos. Texte und Untersuchungen zur Philosophie- und Literaturgeschichte*, Munchen: Langen/Muller 1906 (repr. Amsterdam: Hakkert 1965);

Dalley, S., *Myths from Mesopotamia. Creation, The Flood, Gilgamesh, and Others...*, Oxford/ New York: Oxford UP 1991;

Dawson, Chr.M., "The Iambi of Callimachus. A Hellenistic Poet's Experimental Laboratory", *YCS* 11, 1950, 3-168;

Dearden, C.W., *The Stage of Aristophanes*, London: Athlone P 1976;

Del Re, R., "L' epigramma greco dal II secolo a.C. ai primi tempi dell' Impero", *GIF* 19, 1966, 131-140;

Degani, E., "Note archilochee", *QUCC* 21, 1976, 23-25;

Denniston, J.D.-Page, D., *Aeschylus' Agamemnon*, Oxford: Clarendon P 1957;

Dickie, M.W., "*Dike* as a Moral Term in Homer and Hesiod", *CW* 73, 1978, 91-101;

Diès, A., *Le Politique* (*Platon. Œuvres complètes* 9.1), Budé, 1960;

Dobrov, G., "Aristophanes' *Birds* and the Metaphor of Deferral", *Arethusa* 23, 1990, 209-233;

Dodds, E.R., *Plato Gorgias*, Oxford 1959;

id., *Euripides Bacchae*, Oxford· Clarendon P 1960² (repr. 1986);

Dover, K.J., "Notes on Aristophanes' *Acharnians*", *Maia n.s.* 15, 1963, 6-25;

id., "Aristophanes' Speech in Plato's *Symposium*", *JHS* 86, 1966, 41-50;

id., *Aristophanic Comedy*, London: Batsford 1972;

id., *Aristophanes Frogs*, Oxford: Clarendon P 1993;

Drerup, E., *Demosthenes im Urteile des Altertums (von Theopomp bis Tzetzes: Geschichte, Roman, Legende)*, Wurzburg: Becker 1923;

Droz, G., *Les mythes platoniciens*, Paris (Éditions du Seuil) 1992;

Duchemin, J., "Recherche sur un thème Aristophanien et ses sources religieuses: les voyages dans l'autre monde", *LEC* 25, 1957, 273-295;

ead., *La houlette et la lyre. Recherche sur les origines pastorales de la poésie*, I: *Hermès et Apollon*, Paris: Les Belles Lettres 1960(a);

ead., "Mythes Grecs et Sources Orientales", *Euphrosyne n.s.* 7, 1975/1976, 29-48;

Duff, J.W.-Duff, A.M., *Minor Latin Poets*, II, Loeb, rev. ed. 1935 (repr. 1982);

Dumont, J.-P., *Les Sophistes. Fragments et témoignages*, Paris: PUF 1969;

Dumortier, J., *Les Images dans la Poésie d'Eschyle*, Paris: Les Belles Lettres 1935;

Dunbar, N., *Aristophanes. Birds*, Oxford: Clarendon P 1995;

Dyson, G.W., "ΛΕΟΝΤΑ ΤΕΚΕΙΝ", *CQ* 23, 1929, 186-195;

Earp, F.R., *The Style of Aeschylus*, New York: Russell & Russell 1948 (repr. 1970);

Easterling, P.E.- Knox, B.M.W. (eds.), *The Cambridge History of Classical Literature*, I: *Greek Literature*, 1-4, Cambridge...: UP 1989;

Edelstein, L., "The Function of the Myth in Plato's Philosophy", *JHI* 10, 1949, 463-481;

Edmonds, J.M., *Lyra Graeca*, III, Loeb, 1940² (repr. 1980);
Edmunds, L., "Aristophanes' *Acharnians*", *YCS* 26, 1980, 1-41;
Effe, B., "Der Aufbau von Nikanders Theriaka und Alexipharmaka", *RhM n.s.* 117, 1974, 53-66;
Enger, R.-Fluss, Th.-Gilbert, W., *Aeschylos' Agamemnon*, Leipzig: Teubner 1895³;
Erbse, H., review of Radermacher 1954, *Gnomon* 28, 1956, 272-278;
id., *Studien zum Verstandnis Herodots*, Berlin/New York: De Gruyter;
id., *Die Funktion des Rechtsgedankens in Hesiods 'Erga'*, *Hermes* 121, 1993, 12-28;
Everson, S. (ed.), *Aristotle. The Politics*, Cambridge/New York/New Rochelle/Melbourne/Sydney: Cambridge UP 1988;
Ferguson, J., *Callimachus*, Boston: Twaynes 1980;
Farnell, L.R., *Critical Commentary to the Works of Pindar*, London: MacMillan 1932 (repr. Amsterdam: Hakkert 1961);
Ferrari, G.R.F., *Listening to the Cicadas. A Study of Plato's* Phaedrus, Cambridge/New York/New Rochelle/Melbourne/Sydney 1987 (repr. 1988);
Flower, M.A., *Theopompus of Chios. History and Rhetoric in the Fourth Century B.C.*, Oxford: Clarendon P 1994;
Fontaine, J., *Isidore de Seville et la culture classique dans l'Espagne Wisigothique*, Paris: Études Augustiniennes 1959;
Forbes, P.B.R., "Hesiod *versus* Perses", *CR* 64, 1950, 82-87;
Fortenbaugh, W.W., "Theophrastus, Source no. 709 FHS&G", in: Abbenes-Slings-Sluiter 1995, 1-16;
Fowler, B.H., "The Creatures and the Blood", *ICS* 16, 1991, 85-100;
Fraenkel, E., *Aeschylus Agamemnon*, I-III, Oxford: Clarendon P 1950;
id., *Beobachtungen zu Aristophanes*, Roma: Edizioni di Storia e Letteratura 1962;
Frankel, H., *Dichtung und Philosophie des fruhen Griechentums. Eine Geschichte der griechischen Epik, Lyrik und Prosa bis zur Mitte des funften Jahrhunderts*, München: Beck 1976³;
Frangini, G., "Osservazioni sulliuso dell'immagine in Eschilo", *Dioniso* 51, 1980, 97-117;
Fraser, P.M., *Ptolemaic Alexandria*, I-III, Oxford: Clarendon P 1972;
Freese, J.H., *Aristotle. The 'Art' of Rhetoric*, Loeb, 1926 (repr. 1967);
Friedlander, P., *Platon*, I-III, Berlin· De Gruyter 1954²-1957²-1960²;
Frutiger, P., *Les mythes de Platon. Étude philosophique et littéraire*, Paris: Alcan 1930 (repr.: New York: Arno P 1976);
Fuhrer, R., *Formproblem-Untersuchungen zu den Reden in der fruhgriechischen Lyrik*, München: Berck 1967;
Fuiley, W D., "Antiphon der Athener: Ein Sophist als Psychotherapeut?", *RhM* 135, 1992, 198-216;
Furley, D.J.,-Nehamas, A. (eds.), *Aristotle's* Rhetoric. *Philosophical Essays*, Princeton, NJ: UP 1994;
Fusillo, M., *[Omero]. La battaglia delle rane e dei topi. Batrachomyomachia*, Milano: Guerini 1988;
Gagarin, M., "*Dike* in the *Works and Days*", *CPh* 68, 1973, 81-94;
id., "*Dike* in Archaic Greek Thought", *CPh* 69, 1974, 186-197;
id., *Æschylean Drama*, Berkeley/Los Angeles/London: U of California P 1976;
Gallavotti, C., *Callimaco. Il libro dei Giambi*, Napoli: Macchiaroli 1946;
Gallop, D., *Plato Phaedo*, Oxford: Clarendon P 1975;
Gantz, T., "The Chorus of Aischylos' *Agamemnon*", *HSCPh* 87, 1983, 65-86;
Geer, R.M., *Diodorus of Sicily*, IX, Loeb, 1947 (repr. 1962);

Geffcken, J., "Leonidas von Tarent", *Jahrbucher für classische Philologie*, Suppl. 23, 1897, 1-164;

Gellie, G.H., *Sophocles. A Reading*, Melbourne UP 1972;

Gelzer, Th. (ed.), *Karl Meuli. Gesammelte Schriften*, II, Basel/Stuttgart: Schwabe 1975;

Γεωργοπαπαδάκος, A. *et alii*, *Το μεγάλο λεξικό της νεοελληνικής γλώσσας μονοτονικό*, Αθήνα/Θεσσαλονίκη: Μαλλιάρης-Παιδεία 1989-19905;

Gerhard, G.A., *Phoinix von Kolophon*, Leipzig/Berlin: Teubner 1909;

Giangrande, L., *The Use of* Spoudaiogeloion *in Greek and Roman Literature*, 's-Gravenhage/Paris: Mouton 1972;

Giannini, A., "Archiloco alla luce dei nuovi ritrovamenti", *Acme* 11, 1958, 41-96;

Gigon, O., *Kommentar zum zweiten Buch von Xenophons Memorabilien*, Basel: Reinhardt 1956;

Glei, R., *Die Batrachomyomachie. Synoptische Edition und Kommentar*, Diss. Frankfurt am Main: Lang 1984;

Gorgemans, H., "Zur Deutung der Szene am Ilissos in Platons *Phaidros*", in: Most-Petersmann-Ritter 1993, 122-147;

Goldhill, S., *Language, sexuality, narrative: the* Oresteia, Cambridge...: UP 1984;

Gomperz, H., *Sophistik und Rhetorik. Das Bildungsideal des ΕΥ ΛΕΓΕΙΝ in seinem Verhaltnis zur Philosophie des V. Jahrhunderts*, Leipzig/Berlin 1912 (repr. Stuttgart: Teubner 1965);

Gow, A.S.F.-Page D.L., *The Greek Anthology. Hellenistic Epigrams*, I-II, Cambridge: UP 1965;

eidem, *The Greek Anthology. The Garland of Philip and Some Contemporary Epigrams*, I-II, Cambridge: UP 1968;

Graves, R., *The Greek Myths*, I-II, London. Penguin 1960²;

Grimaldi, W.M.A., S.J., *Aristotle*, Rhetoric *II. A Commentary*, New York: Fordham UP 1988;

Griswold, C.L., Jr., *Self-Knowledge in Plato's* Phaedrus, New Haven/London: Yale UP 1986;

Groeneboom, P., *Aeschylus' Agamemnon*, Groningen 1944;

Van Groningen, B.A., *Théognis. Le premier livre édité avec un commentaire*, Amsterdam: Noord-Hollandsche Uitgevers Maatschappij 1966;

Grube, G.M.A., *A Greek Critic: Demetrius on Style*, Toronto 1961;

Gulick, C.B., *Athenaeus. The Deipnosophists*, VI, Loeb, 1937 (repr. 1959);

Hackforth, R., *Plato's Phaedrus*, Cambridge: UP 1952;

Handel, P., *Formen und Darstellungsweisen in der aristophanischen Komödie*, Heidelberg: Winter 1963;

Harriott, R.M., *Aristophanes. Poet & Dramatist*, London/Sydney: Croom Helm 1986;

Hart, J., *Herodotus and Greek History*, London/Canberra: Croom Helm; New York: St. Martin's P 1982;

Heberlein, F., *Pluthygieia. Zur Gegenwelt bei Aristophanes*, Frankfurt: Haag + Herchen 1980;

Henderson, J., "*Lysistrate*: The Play and its Themes", *YCS* 26, 1980, 153-218;

id., *Aristophanes'* Lysistrata, Oxford: Clarendon P 1987 (repr. 1990);

id., *The Maculate Muse. Obscene Language in Attic Comedy*, New York/Oxford: UP 1991²;

Hicks, R.D., *Diogenes Laertius. Lives of Eminent Philosophers*, I-II, Loeb, 1925 (repr. 1965-1966);

Hinman, W.S., *Literary Quotation and Allusion in the* Rhetoric, Poetics and Nicomachean Ethics of Aristotle, diss. Staten Island, N.Y. 1935;

Hirzel, R., "Aristoxenos und Platons erster Alkibiades", *RhM* 45, 1890, 419-435;
id., *Der Dialog. Ein literarhistorischer Versuch*, I-II, Leipzig: Hirzel 1895;
Hock, R.F., O'Neil, A.N., *The Chreia in Ancient Rhetoric*, I: *The* Progymnasmata, Atlanta, Georgia: Scholars P 1986;
Hofmann, E., *Qua ratione ΕΠΟΣ, ΜΥΘΟΣ, ΑΙΝΟΣ, ΛΟΓΟΣ et vocabula ab eisdem stirpibus derivata in antiquo Graecorum sermone (usque ad annum fere 400) adhibita sint*, Diss. Göttingen 1922 (repr. in: Tarán, L. (ed.), *Greek & Roman Philosophy* 14, New York/London: Garland 1987);
Hofmann, H., *Mythos und Komödie. Untersuchungen zu den* Vögeln *des Aristophanes*, Hildesheim/New York: Olms 1976;
Hogan, J.C., *A Commentary on the Complete Greek Tragedies. Aeschylus*, Chicago/London: U of Chicago P 1984;
Hohti, P., *The Interrelation of Speech and Action in the Histories of Herodotus*, Helsinki/Helsingfors: Societas Scientiarum Fennica 1976;
Holden, H.A., *Plutarch's Life of Demosthenes*, Cambridge: UP 1893;
Holt, Ph., "The Debate-Scenes in the *Ajax*", *AJPh* 102, 1981, 275-288;
Hoving, W., *Studiën over Aeschylus' Agamemnon*, Purmerend: Muusses 1928 (diss. Groningen);
How, W.W.-Wells, J., *A Commentary on Herodotus*, I-II, Oxford: Clarendon P 1928[2] (repr. 1950);
Howald, E., *Der Dichter Kallimachos von Kyrene*, Erlenbach-Zürich: Rentsch 1943;
Hubbard, Th.K., *The Mask of Comedy. Aristophanes and the Intertextual Parabasis*, Ithaca/London: Cornell UP 1991;
Hubbell, H.M., "The Rhetorica of Philodemus", *Transactions of the Connecticut Academy of Arts and Sciences* 23, 1919/1920, 247-382;
Hunger, H., *Die hochsprachliche profane Literatur der Byzantiner*, I-II, München: Beck 1978;
Hurst, A., "Aeschylus or Euripides? Aristophanes: Frogs 1413 and 1434", *Hermes* 99, 1971, 227-240;
Hutchinson, G.O., *Hellenistic Poetry*, Oxford: Clarendon P 1988 (repr. 1990);
Immerwahr, H.R., *Form and Thought in Herodotus*, Cleveland, Ohio 1966 (repr. Atlanta, Georgia: Scholars P 1986);
Jacoby, E., *De Antiphontis sophistae Περὶ ὁμονοίας libro*, Diss. Berlin: Reimer 1908;
Joel, K., *Der echte und der Xenophontische Sokrates*, I-II, Berlin: Gaertner 1901;
Jowett, B., *Politica*, Forster, E.S., *Oeconomica*, Kenyon, F.G., *Atheniensium Respublica*, Oxford: Clarendon P 1921 (repr. 1961);
id., *Aristotle's Politics*, New York: Modern Library 1943;
id.-Campbell, L., *Plato's Republic*, III: *Notes*, Oxford: Clarendon P 1894;
Kahn, C.H., "Democritus and the Origins of Moral Psychology", *AJPh* 106, 1985, 1-31;
Kambylis, A., *Die Dichterweihe und ihre Symbolik. Untersuchungen zu Hesiodos, Kallimachos, Properz und Ennius*, Heidelberg: Winter 1965;
Kamerbeek, J.C., *The Plays of Sophocles. Commentaries*, I: *The Ajax*, Leiden 1953;
Καψωμενος, Στ.Γ., "Συμβολὴ εἰς τὴν ἑρμηνείαν τοῦ δευτέρου Ἰάμβου τοῦ Καλλιμάχου," *Ἀθηνᾶ* 47, 1937, 28-36;
Kassel, R., *Der Text der aristotelischen Rhetorik. Prolegomena zu einer kritischen Ausgabe*, Berlin/New York: De Gruyter 1971;
Kaster, R.A., *C. Suetonius Tranquillus De Grammaticis et Rhetoribus*, Oxford: Clarendon P 1995;

Kennedy, G.A., *Aristotle On Rhetoric. A Theory of Civic Discourse*, New York/Oxford: Oxford UP 1991;

Kerferd, G.B., *The Sophists and their Legacy. Proceedings of the Fourth International Colloquium on Ancient Philosophy Held in Cooperation with Projektgruppe Altertumswissenschaften der Thyssen Stiftung at Bad Homburg, 29th August - 1st September 1979*, Wiesbaden: Steiner 1981;

Keyt, D.-Miller, F.D. (eds.), Jr., *A Companion to Aristotle's* Politics, Oxford/Cambridge, MA: Blackwell 1991;

Kirk, G.S. (ed.), *The Iliad. A Commentary*, I-VI, Cambridge: UP 1993;

id.-Raven, J.E., *The Presocratic Philosophers. A Critical History with a Selection of Texts*, Cambridge: UP 1960 (corr. 1957; repr. 1979);

Kirkwood, G.M., *Early Greek Monody. The History of a Poetic Type*, New York/London 1974;

id., *Selections from Pindar*, Chico, California: Scholars P 1982;

Kleine, O.F., *Stesichori Himerensis fragmenta*, Berlin: Reimer 1828;

Klinger, V., "De Archilochi fragmento papyraceo 79 D^2 eiusque exordio nondum recognito", *Eos* 43.1, 1948/1949.1, 40-47;

Knox, A.D., "The Cercidas Papers", *CR* 38, 1924, 101-104;

id., "Herodes and Callimachus. ΟΔΟΥ ΠΑΡΟΥΣΗΣ ΤΗΝ ΑΤΑΡΠΙΤΟΝ ΖΗΤΕΙΣ", *Philologus* 81, 1926, 241-255;

Kock, Th., *Ausgewählte Komödien des Aristophanes*, III: *Die Frösche*, Berlin: Weidmann 1881;

Körte, A., "Literarische Texte mit Ausschluß der christlichen", *APF* 11, 1933, 220-283;

Lahmer, K., "Wahnsinn und Wissen als dominantes Strukturmermal im *Aias* des Sophokles", *SIFC s.III*, 77.2, 1984, 174-192;

Laks, A., "Substitution et connaissance: une interprétation unitaire (ou presque) de la théorie aristotélicienne de la métaphore", in: Furley-Nehamas 1994, 283-305;

Landfester, M., *Handlungsverlauf und Komik in den frühen Komödien des Aristophanes*, Berlin/New York: De Gruyter 1977;

Lasserre, F., "Un nouveau fragment d'Archiloque", *MH* 5, 1948, 6-15;

id., *Les Epodes d'Archiloque*, Paris: Les Belles Lettres 1950;

id.-Bonnard, A., *Archiloque. Fragments*, Paris: Les Belles Lettres 1958;

Latacz, J., *Einführung in die griechische Tragödie*, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht 1993;

Latte, K., "Zeitgeschichtliches zu Archilochos", *Hermes* 92, 1964, 385-390;

Laue, H., *De Democriti fragmentis ethicis*, Diss. Göttingen: Van Acken 1921;

Lausberg, M., *Das Einzeldistichon. Studien zum antiken Epigramm*, München: Fink 1982;

Lebeck, A., *The Oresteia. A Study in Language and Structure*, Washington, D.C. 1971;

Van Leeuwen, J., *Aristophanis Ranae*, Leiden: Sijthoff 1896;

id., *Aristophanis Acharnenses*, Leiden: Sijthoff 1901;

id., *Aristophanis Aves*, Leiden: Sijthoff 1902;

id., *Aristophanis Lysistrata*, Leiden: Sijthoff 1903

id., *Aristophanis Pax*, Leiden: Sijthoff 1906;

id., *Aristophanis Vespae*, Leiden: Sijthoff 1909;

Lefèvre, E., "Die Unfähigkeit, sich zu erkennen: Sophokles' *Aias*", *WJA n.s.* 17, 1991, 91-117;

Legrand, Ph.-E., *Étude sur Théocrite*, diss. Paris: Fontemoing 1898;

Van Lennep, D.I., *Hesiodi Opera et Dies*, Amsterdam: Mueller 1847;

Lesky, A., *Geschichte der griechischen Literatur*, Bern/Munchen: Francke 1971³ (repr. 1993);

Livrea, E., *Studi cercidei (P. Oxy. 1082)*, Bonn: Habelt 1986;

Lloyd, G.E.R., *Polarity and Analogy. Two Types of Argumentation in Early Greek Thought*, Cambridge: UP 1966;

Lloyd-Jones, H., "Agamemnonea", *HSCPh* 73, 1969, 97-104;

Long, T., *Repetition and Variation in the Short Stories of Herodotus*, Frankfurt am Main: Athenäum 1987;

Loriaux, R., S.J., *Le Phédon de Platon*, I (57a-84b), Namur: Secrétariat des Publications; Gembloux: Duculot 1969;

id., "Zu Archilochus", *Philologus* 105, 1961, 178-197;

MacDowell, D.M., *Aristophanes Wasps*, Oxford: Clarendon P 1971;

March, J.R., "Sophocles' *Ajax*: The Death and Burial of a Hero", *BICS* 38, 1991-1993, 1-36, Pl. 1-4b;

Marr, J.L., "Who Said What About Alcibiades? *Frogs* 1422-34", *CQ* 20, 1970, 53-55;

Mazon, P., *Hésiode*, Budé, 1928 (repr. 1960);

Mazzoli, G., *Seneca e la poesia*, Milano: Ceschia 1970;

McKay, K.J., "The Melody of Hesiod", *SO* 36, 1960, 17-20;

id., "Hesiod, Op. 209-211", *Hermes* 90, 1962, 249-251;

id., "Callimachea", *SO* 45, 1970, 38-48;

McLeish, K., *The Theatre of Aristophanes*, Bath: Thames and Hudson 1980;

Medaglia, S.M., *Note di esegesi archilochea*, Suppl. 4 Bollettino dei Classici Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei 1982;

Merlan, Ph., "Isocrates, Aristotle and Alexander the Great", *Historia* 3, 1954-1955, 60-81;

Mette, H.J., "Echte Selbstanrede bei Archilochos? Zu Pap. Ox. 2316", *MH* 18, 1961, 35-36;

id., *Der verlorene Aischylos*, Berlin 1963;

Meuli, K., "Ein Altpersischer Kriegsbrauch", in: Gelzer 1975, 699-729 (first appeared in: *"Westostliche Abhandlungen" Rudolf Tschudi zum siebzigsten Geburtstag*, Wiesbaden: Harassowitz 1954(b), 63-86);

Meyer-Lubke, W., *Romanisches etymologisches Worterbuch*, Heidelberg: Winter 1911;

Miller, H.W., "Comic Iteration in Aristophanes", *AJA* 66, 1945, 398-408;

Momigliano, A., "Sul pensiero di Antifonte il Sofista", *RFIC n.s.* 8, 1930, 129-140;

Moors, K.F., *Platonic Myth. An Introductory Study*, Washington, D.C.: UP of America 1982;

Moorton, R.F., Jr, "Aristophanes on Alcibiades", *GRBS* 29, 1988, 345-359;

Most, G.W., "Two Leaden Metaphors in Pindar *P.* 2", *AJPh* 108, 1987, 569-584;

id.-Petersmann, H.-Ritter, A.M. (eds.), *Philanthropia kai Eusebeia. Festschrift für Albrecht Dihle zum 70. Geburtstag*, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht 1993;

Murray, G., *Aristophanes. The Frogs*, London: Allen & Unwin 1908 (repr. 1965);

id., *Aristophanes. A Study*, Oxford: Clarendon P 1933;

Muth, R., "Zu Call., Ia. IV, fr. 194, 37.40 Pf.", *AAHG* 4, 1951, 251-253;

Nagy, G., *The Best of the Achaeans. Concepts of the Hero in Archaic Greek Poetry*, Baltimore/London: Johns Hopkins UP 1979;

Neitzel, H., "Pandora und das Fass", *Hermes* 104, 1976, 387-419;

Nestle, W., *Vom Mythos zum Logos. Die Selbstentfaltung des griechischen Denkens von Homer bis auf die Sophistik und Sokrates*, Stuttgart 1942² (repr.: Aalen 1966);

id., *Griechische Geistesgeschichte von Homer bis Lukian. In ihrer Entfaltung vom mythischen zum rationalen Denken dargestellt*, Stuttgart 1944;
Newiger, H.-J., *Metapher und Allegorie. Studien zu Aristophanes*, Munchen: Beck 1957;
id., "Zum Text der 'Frösche' des Aristophanes", *Hermes* 113, 1985, 429-448;
Newman, W.L., *The Politics of Aristotle*, III, Oxford: Clarendon P 1902 (repr. 1950);
Nicolai, W., *Hesiods Erga. Beobachtungen zum Aufbau*, Heidelberg 1964;
Nill, M., *Morality and Self-Interest in Protagoras, Antiphon and Democritus*, Leiden: Brill 1985;
Østerud, S., "The Individuality of Hesiod", *Hermes* 104, 1976, 13-29;
Page, D., "Archilochus and the Oral Tradition", in: Reverdin 1964, 117-179;
id.-Dawe, R.D.-Diggle, J., *Further Greek Epigrams. Epigrams Before A.D. 50 from the Greek Anthology and Other Sources, not Included in 'Hellenistic Epigrams' or The Garland of Philip'*, Cambridge...: UP 1981;
Paley, F.A., *The Epics of Hesiod*, London: Whittaker/Bell 1883²;
Paquet, L., *Les Cyniques grecs. Fragments et témoignages*, Ottawa: Presses de l'Université 1990²;
Paton, W.R., *The Greek Anthology*, I-V, Loeb, 1916-1918;
Pearce, T.E.V., "The Function of the *Locus Amoenus* in Theocritus' Seventh Poem", *RhM* 131, 1988, 276-304;
Pearson, A.C., *The Fragments of Sophocles*, Cambridge: UP 1917 (repr. Amsterdam: Hakkert 1963);
Peck, A.L.-Forster, E.S., *Aristotle*, XII: *Parts of Animals. Movement of Animals. Progression of Animals*, Loeb, 1961 (corr. 1945 corr. 1937; repr. 1968);
Pellizer, E.-Tedeschi, G., *Semonide*, Roma: Ateneo 1990;
Pendrick, G., "Once Again Antiphon the Sophist and Antiphon of Rhamnus", *Hermes* 115, 1987, 47-60;
Perrin, B., *Plutarch's Lives*, VII: *Demosthenes and Cicero...*, Loeb, 1919;
Pfister, M., "Konzepte der Intertextualität", in: Broich-Pfister 1985, 1-30;
Piccone, E.H., "Four Features of Dialectic in Plato's *Phaedrus*", in: Rossetti 1992, 261-264;
Pieper, J., *Über die Platonischen Mythen*, München 1965;
Pignani, A., *Niceforo Basilace. Progymnasmi e monodie*, Napoli: Bibliopolis 1983;
Platnauer, M., *Aristophanes Peace*, Oxford: Clarendon P 1964;
Pomey, P.F., *Novus Candidatus rhetoricae*, 1665 (quoted from ed. Lyon: Molin 1706);
Pozzi, D.C., "The Pastoral Ideal in *The Birds* of Aristophanes", *CJ* 81, 1985-1986, 119-129;
Pucci, P., *Hesiod and the Language of Poetry*, Baltimore/London: Johns Hopkins UP 1977;
Puelma Piwonka, M., *Lucilius und Kallimachos. Zur Geschichte einer Gattung der hellenistisch-römischen Poesie*, Frankfurt am Main: Klostermann 1949 (repr. New York/London: Garland 1978);
id. (Puelma), "Kallimachos-Interpretationen. II. Der Epilog zu den Aitien", *Philologus* 101, 1957, 247-268 (repr. with "Addenda" in: Puelma 1995, 189-216);
id., *Labor et lima. Kleine Schriften und Nachträge* (Hrsg. Fasel, I.), Basel: Schwabe 1995;
Rabe, H., *Aphthonii progymnasmata*, Leipzig: Teubner 1926;
Rackham, H., *Aristotle Politics*, Loeb, 1944² (repr. 1959);
Raddatz, G., *De Promethei fabula Hesiodea et de compositione Operum*, Diss. Greifswald: Abel 1909;
Radermacher, L.-Kraus, W., *Aristophanes' 'Frösche'...*, *SAWW* 198.4, 1954²;

Rankin, H.D., "Archilochus in Pindar *Pythian* 2", *Emerita* 43, 1975, 249-255;
id., *Antisthenes Sokratikos*, Amsterdam 1986;
Rau, P., *Paratragodia. Untersuchung einer komischen Form des Aristophanes*, München: Beck 1967;
Raubitschek, A.E., "Aristoteles über den Ostrakismos", *Tyche* 1, 1986, 169-174;
Reale, G., *Platone. Fedone*, Brescia: La Scuola 1973[3];
Reche Martínez, M.D., *Teón, Hermógenes, Aftonio. Ejercicios de retórica*, Madrid: Gredos 1991;
Reinach, Th., *De Archia Poeta*, Paris: Leroux 1890;
Reinhardt, K., "Platons Mythen", in: id. 1960, 219-295 (first appeared: Bonn: Verlag Cohen 1927);
id., "Personifikation und Allegorie", in: id. 1960, 7-40 (unpublished; ca. 1937);
id., *Vermächtnis der Antike. Gesammelte Essays zur Philosophie und Geschichtsschreibung*, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht 1960;
Reitzenstein, R., *Epigramm und Skolion. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Alexandrinischen Dichtung*, Giessen: Ricker 1893 (repr.: Hildesheim/New York: Olms 1970);
Renehan, R., "The Greek Anthropocentric View of Man", *HSCPh* 85, 1981, 239-259;
Rennie, W., *The Acharnians of Aristophanes*..., London: Arnold 1909;
Reverdin, O. (ed.), *Archiloque*, Genève: Fondation Hardt 1964;
Riffaterre, M., "Compulsory Reader Response: The Intertextual Drive", in: Worton-Still 1990, 56-78;
Rizzo, G.E., *Questioni Stesicoree*, I: *Vita e scuola poetica*, Messina: D'Amico 1895;
Roberts, W.R., *Rhetorica*, Forster, E.S., *De Rhetorica ad Alexandrum*, Bywater, I., *De Poetica*, Oxford: Clarendon P 1946 (repr. 1959) ;
Robertson, N., "Timocreon and Themistocles", *AJPh* 101, 1980, 61-78;
Robin, L., *Platon. Œuvres complètes*, IV.3: *Phèdre*, Budé, 1961[5];
id., *Platon. Œuvres complètes*, IV.1: *Phédon*, Budé, 1963[8];
Robinson, R., *Aristotle's* Politics, Oxford: Clarendon P 1962;
Rodgers, V.A., "Some Thoughts on *δίκη*", *CQ* *n.s.* 21 (65), 1971, 289-301;
Rodrigo, P., "Dialectique autochtone et rhétorique nomade dans le *Phèdre* de Platon", in: Rossetti 1992, 269-274;
Rogers, B.B., *The Birds of Aristophanes*, London: Bell & Sons 1906;
Rohde, E., *Der griechische Roman und seine Vorläufer*, Leipzig: Breitkopf und Härtel 1914[3];
Romano, F., *Logos e mythos nella psicologia di Platone*, Padova: CEDAM 1964;
Romilly, J. de (ed.), *Sophocle* Ajax, Paris 1976;
ead. (ed.), *Sophocle*, Genève: Fondation Hardt 1983;
ead., *The Great Sophists in Periclean Athens*, Oxford: Clarendon P 1992 (transl. by Lloyd, J. of: *Les grands sophistes dans l'Athènes de Périclès*, 1988);
Rose, H.J., *A Commentary on the Surviving Plays of Aeschylus*, I-II, Amsterdam: Noord-Hollandsche Uitgevers-Maatschappij 1958;
Rosen, R.M., "The Ionian at Aristophanes *Peace* 46", *GRBS* 25, 1984, 389-396;
Rosenmeyer, T.G., *The Art of Aeschylus*, Berkeley/Los Angeles/London: U of California P 1982;
Rossetti, L., "Ricerche sui 'Dialoghi Socratici' di Fedone e di Euclide", *Hermes* 108, 1980, 183-200;
id., *Understanding the* Phaedrus. *Proceedings of the II Symposium Platonicum*, Sankt Augustin: Academia Verlag 1992;

Rowe, C.J., *Essential Hesiod. Theogony 1-232, 453-733; Works and Days 1-307*, Bristol 1978;

id., *Plato: Phaedrus*, Warminster: Aris & Phillips 1988²;

id., *Plato. Phaedo*, Cambridge: UP 1993;

Russo, C.F., *Aristofane. Autore di teatro*, Firenze: Sansoni 1962;

Russo, J.-Fernández-Galiano, M.-Heubeck, A., *A Commentary on Homer's Odyssey*, III: *Books XVII-XXIV*, Oxford: Clarendon P 1992;

Sansone, D., *Aeschylean Metaphors for Intellectual Activity*, Wiesbaden: Steiner 1975;

Scaliger, J.C., *Poetices libri septem*, Lyon: Vincentius 1561 (repr. Stuttgart-Bad Cannstatt: Frommann (Holzboog) 1964);

Schadewaldt, W., "Aischylos' Achilleis", *Hermes* 71, 1936, 25-69;

id., *Die Anfänge der Geschichtsschreibung bei den Hellenen. Herodot. Thukydides*, Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp 1982;

Schlesinger, A.C., "Indications of Parody in Aristophanes", *TAPhA* 67, 1936, 296-314;

id., "Indications of Parodies in Aristophanes", *AJPh* 58, 1937, 294-305;

Schmidt, J.-U., *Addressat und Paraineseform. Zur Intention von Hesiods 'Werken und Tagen'*, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck&Ruprecht 1986;

Schranz, W., *Theopomps Philippika*, Diss. Marburg i. Hessen 1912;

Schütrumpf, E., *Aristoteles. Politik. Buch II... III...*, Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft 1991;

Seale, D., *Vision and Stagecraft in Sophocles*, London/Canberra: Croom Helm 1982;

Segal, C., "Theocritus' Seventh Idyll and Lycidas", *WS n.s.* 8, 1974(a), 20-76;

id , *Tragedy and Civilization. An Interpretation of Sophocles*, Cambridge, MA/London: Harvard UP 1981;

Sellschopp, I., *Stilistische Untersuchungen zu Hesiod*, Diss. Hamburg 1934 (repr. Darmstadt: Wissenschafltiche Buchgesellschaft 1967), 84-86;

Setti, G., *Studi sulla Antologia greca. Gli epigrammi degli Antipatri*, Torino: Loescher 1890;

Sheppard, J.T., "Politics in the *Frogs* of Aristophanes", *JHS* 30, 1910, 249-259;

Shimron, B., *Politics and Belief in Herodotus*, Stuttgart: Steiner 1989;

Shrimpton, G., "Theopompus' Treatment of Philip in the *Philippica*", *Phoenix* 31, 123-144;

Sicking, C.M.J., *Aristophanes' Ranae. Een hoofdstuk uit de geschiedenis der Griekse poetica*, diss. Assen: Van Gorcum/Prakke & Prakke 1962;

Sidney, Ph., *An Apologie for Poetrie*, London: Olney 1595 (quoted from ed. Shepherd, G., Manchester: UP 1973 (repr. 1980));

Silk, M.S., *Interaction in Poetic Imagery with special reference to early Greek poetry*, Cambridge: UP 1974;

Sinclair, T.A., *Hesiod. Works and Days*, London: MacMillan 1932;

Skafte Jensen, M., "Tradition and Individuality in Hesiod's Works and Days", *C&M* 27, 1966, 1-27;

Slings, S.R., review of older ed. of Adrados 1990, *Mnemosyne* 36, 1983(a), 393-396;

Smith, R.W., *The Art of Rhetoric in Alexandria. Its Theory and Practice in the Ancient World*, 's-Gravenhage: Nijhoff 1974;

Solmsen, F., *Hesiod and Aeschylus*, Ithaca, New York: Cornell UP 1949;

Sommerstein, A.H., *Acharnians*, Warmington 1980;

id., *Wasps*, Warminster: Aris & Phillips 1983;

id., *Peace*, Warmington: Aris & Phillips; Chicago: Bolchazy-Carducci 1985;

id., *Birds*, Warminster: Aris & Phillips 1987;

id., *Lysistrata*, Warminster: Aris & Phillips 1990;

Spinelli, E., "Πλοῦτος e πενίη: Il pensiero economico di Democrito", *Philologus* 135, 1991, 290-319 (136, 1992, 140: "Berichtigung");

Sprague, R.K. (ed.), *The Older Sophists. A Complete Translation by Several Hands of the Fragments in* Die Fragmente der Vorsokratiker *Edited by Diels-Kranz...*, Columbia, South Carolina: UP 1972;

Stanford, W.B., *Aeschylus in his Style. A Study in Language and Personality*, Dublin: UP 1942 (repr. New York/London: Johnson Reprint Corporation 1972);

id., *The Odyssey of Homer*, II *(Books XIII-XXIV)*, London: MacMillan 1948;

id., *Aristophanes. The Frogs*, London: MacMillan; New York: St Martin's P 1963(a);

id., *Sophocles. Ajax*, London: MacMillan; New York: St Martin's P 1963(b);

Starkie, W.J.M., *Ἀριστοφάνους Σφῆκες. The Wasps of Aristophanes*, London: MacMillan 1897 (repr. Amsterdam: Hakkert 1968);

id., *The Acharnians of Aristophanes*, London 1909 (repr. Amsterdam: Hakkert 1968);

Steffen, V., "De Archilocho quasi naturali Hesiodi aemulatore", in: *Scripta Minora Selecta*, I, Wrocław-Warszawa-Kraków-Gdańsk: Zakład Narodowy Imienia Ossolińskich Wydawnictwo Polskiej Akademii Nauk 1973, 22-36 [first appeared in: *Eos* 46, 1952-1953, 33-48];

Steiner, D., *The Crown of Song. Metaphor in Pindar*, London: Duckworth 1986;

Stewart, Z., "Democritus and the Cynics", *HSCPh* 68, 1958, 179-191;

Stewart, J.A.-Levy, G.R., *The Myths of Plato...*, London: Centaur P 1960;

Stewart, R.S., "The Epistemological Function of Platonic Myth", *Ph&Rh* 22, 1989, 260-280;

Stone, I.F., *The Trial of Socrates*, London: Picador 1988;

Stoneman, R., "The 'Theban Eagle'", *CQ n.s.* 26, 1976, 188-197;

Strauss, L., *Xenophon's Socrates*, Ithaca/London: Cornell UP 1972;

Taillardat, J., *Les images d'Aristophane. Études de langue et de style*, Paris: Les Belles Lettres 1965[2];

Taplin, O., *The Stagecraft of Aeschylus. The Dramatic Use of Exits and Entrances in Greek Tragedy*, Oxford: Clarendon P 1977;

Tarditi, G., *Archiloco. Introduzione, testimonianze sulla vita e sull'arte, testo critico, traduzione*, Roma: Ateneo 1968;

Thompson, W.H., *The Phaedrus of Plato...*, London: Whittaker-Bell 1868 (repr. New York: Arno P 1973);

Thomson, G.-Headlam, W., *The Oresteia of Aeschylus*, I-II, Amsterdam/Praag 1966[2];

Thummer, E., "Die zweite pythische Ode Pindars", *RhM n.s.* 115, 1972, 293-307;

Treu, M. [Hrsg.], *Archilochos*, München 1959 (Tusculum);

Tricot, J., *Aristote. La Politique*, Paris: Vrin 1970[2];

Trypanis, C.A., *Callimachus*, Loeb, 1958;

Tzifopoulos, Y.Z., "Proverbs in Menander's *Dyscolos*: The Rhetoric of Popular Wisdom", *Mnemosyne* 48, 1995, 169-177;

Untersteiner, M., *Sofocle. Aiace*, Milano: Signorelli 1956;

Vaio, J., "Aristophanes' *Wasps*. The Relevance of the Final Scenes", *GRBS* 12, 1971, 335-351;

Vara, J., "The Sources of Theocritean Bucolic Poetry", *Mnemosyne* 45, 1992, 333-344;

Verdenius, W.J., *A Commentary on Hesiod*, Works and Days, *vv. 1-382*, Leiden 1985;

Verdin, H.-Schepens, G.-Keyser, E. de, *Purposes of History. Studies in Greek Historiography from the 4th to the 2nd Centuries B.C.. Proceedings of the International Colloquium Leuven, 24-26 May 1988*, Leuven 1990;
Vries, G.J. de, *A Commentary on the Phaedrus of Plato*, Amsterdam: Hakkert 1969;
Vurtheim, J., *Stesichoros' Fragmente und Biographie*, Leiden: Sijthoff 1919;
Wærn, I., *Γῆς ὄστεα. The Kenning in Pre-Christian Greek Poetry*, diss. Uppsala: Almqvist & Wiksell 1951;
Waltz, P., *De Antipatro Sidonio*, Bordeaux: Gounouilhou (diss. Paris) 1906(a);
id., *Hésiode et son poème moral*, Bordeaux: Feret; Paris: Fontemoing 1906(b);
Waters, K.H., *Herodotus the Historian. His Problems, Methods and Originality*, London/Sydney: Croom Helm 1985;
Werner, O., *Aischylos Tragodien und Fragmente*, München 1980[3] (Tusculum);
West, M.L., *Hesiod. Theogony*, Oxford: Clarendon P 1966;
id., "Near Eastern Material in Hellenistic and Roman Literature", *HSCPh* 73, 1969, 113-134;
id., "Stesichorus", *CQ n.s.* 21 (65), 1971, 302-314;
id., *Studies in Greek Elegy and Iambus*, Berlin/New York: De Gruyter 1974;
id., *Hesiod. Works & Days*, Oxford: Clarendon P 1978(a);
id., "The Parodos of the Agamemnon", *CQ* 29, 1979, 1-6;
West, S., "Archilochus' Message-Stick", *CQ* 38, 1988, 42-48;
Whitman, C.H., *Aristophanes and the Comic Hero*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP 1964;
Von Wilamowitz-Mollendorff, U., *Pindaros*, Berlin: Weidmann 1922;
id., *Hellenistische Dichtung in der Zeit des Kallimachos*, I-II, Berlin: Weidmann 1924;
id., *Aristophanes Lysistrate*, Berlin 1927;
Will, F., *Archilochos*, New York 1969;
Willcock, M.M., *Pindar. Victory Odes*, Cambridge: UP 1995;
Wimmel, W., *Kallimachos in Rom. Die Nachfolge seines apologetischen Dichtens in der Augusteerzeit*, Wiesbaden: Steiner 1960 (Hermes Einzelschriften 16);
Winnington-Ingram, R.P., *Sophocles. An Interpretation*, Cambridge/London/New York/New Rochelle/Melbourne/Sydney: Cambridge UP 1980;
Winter, J.G., "Some Literary Papyri", *TAPhA* 53, 1922, 128-141;
Wolke, H., *Untersuchungen zur Batrachomyomachie*, Meisenheim: Hain 1978;
Worton, M.-Still, J. (eds.), *Intertextuality. Theories and Practices*, Manchester: UP 1990 (repr. 1991);
Wright, W.C., *The Works of the Emperor Julian*, I-II, Loeb, 1913 (repr. 1959-1962);
Wust, E., "Skolion und Γεφυρισμός in der alten Komodie", *Philologus* 77 (*n.s.* 31), 1921, 26-45;
Zanetto, G.-Del Corno, D., *Aristofane*, [Milano]: Mondadori 1987.

INDICES[1]

1. *Comparatio numerorum*[2]

Aes.	**AaTh**	***TMI***	**Adrados**	**Van Dijk**
1		K2295, L315.3	H. 1	Archil. 4F1a-h; Ar. 17A3
3		L315.7	H. 3	Semon. 5F2 ?; Ar. 17F5, 17A2, 17A5
4a		J321.1	H. 4	Hes. 2F1; Aristarch. 59A1
8			H. 8	Arist. 57F1
11a		J1909.1	H. 11	Hdt. 31F1
17	64	J758.1	H. 17	Timocr. 10A1
22		K2315	H. 22	54. Epicur. *ap.* Max. Tyr. G34
24		K1022.1	H. 24	*ap.* Aug. G63; Isid. G75
31		J2112.1	H. 31	D.S. 38F2
46	298	L361	H. 46	S. 24A1; Hieronym. Rhod. 55A1
50		J1908.2	H. 50	Stratt. 19A1 ?
63		K477.2	H. 63	Demad. 41F1
81		K730.1	H. 83	Archil. 4F2a-c; Ar. 17A1; Pl. 49A2
100			H. 102	*Scol.* 6A1; Arist. 57A1
101	244	J951.2	H. 103	Phld. 42A1ab
106		A2231.1.4	H. 108	Cerc. 22A1
~130	293	J461.1	H. 132	*ap.* Liv. G11; Quint. G18b
117		A2232.1	H. 119	*ap.* Theon, G20c
133	34A	J1791.4	H. 136	Democr. 47A1; *ap.* Theon, G20c; Sopat. Rh. G58
140		J642.1	H. 145	Hieronym. Hist. 37F1 ?; D.S. 38F1; *ap.* Sopat. Rh. G58
142		J644.1	H. 147	Pl. 49A1; *ap.* Quint. G18b
150	75	B371.1	H. 155	*ap.* Mar. Victor. G47
153		K2061.1.1	H. 158	Aristobul. 36F1, D. 40F1
188	214B	J951.1	H. 199	*ap.* Sopat. Rh. G58
196		J1053	H. 211	*Scol.* 6F1
225		J1061.4	H. 253	cf. Antipho Soph. 45F1
~ 226	275A	K11.3	H. 254	Achae. 15A1; Menedemus Eretr. 53A1
227		U27	H. 255	cf. Antip. Sid. 27F1

[1] The Indices do not include passages referred to only in the notes. The Testimonies have been included only in the *Index locorum*, as they may be found easily in the Synopsis above. The abbreviation "*ap.*" marks fables somehow adduced as exemplifications of the Genre; e.g. Aes. 117 *ap.* Theon, G20c.

[2] This Index only compares the motif numbers of four standard works of reference; it does not imply that these actually mention or discuss the Archaic, Classical, or Hellenistic Greek fable versions.

Aes.	AaTh	*TMI*	Adrados	Van Dijk
262		J956	H. 293	*ap.* Aug. G63; Isid. G75
269a		K192	H. 238	Stesich. 7F2; Philist. 33F1 ?; Arist. 39F1
276a		U161	H. 273	A. 12F1; Ar. 17A4
285		J1853.1.1	H. 284	*ap.* Babr. G19c
325		J1031	no H. 141	*ap.* Gell. G31
331		U242	no H. 154	Th. 32T1 (Σ)
346		L451.3	H. 294	Archil. 4F3 ?
352	112	J211.1	no H. 210	*ap.* Aug. G63; Prisc. G70; Isid. G75
356a			no H. 226	X. 50F1
358				see *Aes.* 188
367			no H. 250	Theopomp. Hist. 35F1
372		J1022	no H. 183	*ap.* Them. G57
373	280A	J711.1	H. 114	*ap.* Aphth. G54
374			no H. 295	Leon. 26F1
395		B521.1, cf. N332.3	no H. 86	Stesich. 7F1; Crates Perg. 60F/A1
397		U113	no H. 127	*ap.* Sopat. Rh. G58
422			no H. 4	Demetr. 43A1; Arist. 57A1
423			no H. 11	Ar. 17F2
424			no H. 12	Socr. 25F1
425			no H. 15	Simon. 9F1; Timocr. 10F2
427		J215.1	no H. 19	Arist. 39F2
428			no H. 22	Ar. 17F3
431			no H. 27	Call. 20F1
432			no H. 28	*ap.* Him. G56
436			no H. 63	Antip. Sid. 27F2
437a		J621.1	H. 39ab	*ap.* D.Chr. G23
438			no H. 72	Ar. 17F4
439		J411.7	no H. 79	Call. 20F2; Ps.-Trypho 61A1
443			no H. 103	Semon. 5F1
445			no H. 117	Pl. 49F1
447			no H. 142	Ar. 17F6; Theoc. 21A1 ?
450		J975	no H. 178	Antisth. 48F1; Arist. 52A1
458			no H. 231	Nic. 3F1; Ibyc. 8F1; Aristias 11F1; S. 14F1; Dinol. 16F1; Apolloph. 18F1; Chrysipp. Stoic. 56A1 (?)
460		J1169.7, K477.2	no H. 235	D. 40F2
464		J648.1	no H. 246	*ap.* Hermog. G41; Prisc. G70
465		J217.1	no H. 248	*ap.* Max. Tyr. G33
[466			no H. 251	Pl. *Smp.* 203bc: see the Appendix below][3]
470			no H. 293	Pl. 49F2
511		K2061.9	H. 81	*ap.* Phaedr. G15b
-				Arist. 34F/A1
-				Timocr. 10F1

[3] Cf. García Gual 1994, 607 on Plu. *Mor.* 303CD (*Aes.* 433).

Aes.	AaTh	*TMI*	Adrados	Van Dijk
(511)			(H. 276)	A. 12F2; Ar. 17A6; [A.] 23A1
-				Ar. 17F1
-				Pl. 49A3
-				Phaedo 51F1ab
-				Demetr. 43A2; auct. inc. 58F/A1
-				Arch. Mytil. 29F1
-				Arch. Antioch. 30F1
-				Carpyllides 28F1
T4				cf. Phaedr. G14; Gell. G31; Luc. G32; Max. Tyr. G34; Isid. G75
T5				Mnesim. G4; Σ *in* Ar. G66a
T19				Jul. G50
T20				Ar. 17F5
T21				Ar. 17T27a (Σ)
T23				Call. 20F1.15 ταῦτα-17
T30				Him. G55
T40				see above, *Aes.* 424
T41				see above, *Aes.* 427
T42				Hsch. G69d
T44				cf. Avian. G59
T45				see above, T5
T50				Agath. G71
T51				Tat. G38
T52				Philostr. G43
T53				Ar. G1a, cf. G1c
T54				Luc. G32
T55				cf. Avian. G59
T56				Him. G55
T57				cf. Phaedr. G14
T59				cf. Hermog. G41
T62				cf. Philostr. G42
T63				cf. Babr. G19b
T64				cf. Isid. G75
T65				cf. Theon, G20c
T67				*Vit. Aesop.* G40c
T68				cf. Aphth. G54
T69				Ar. 17A2.129-130
T70				Ar. G2
T71				Ar. 17A3; Σ *in* Ar. G66b
T72			no H. 145	S. 13F1
T72				S. 13F2
T73				Pl. G3
T76				Phaedr. G12
T76a				cf. Phaedr. G13
T76b				cf. Phaedr. G14
T77				Sen. G17
T79				cf. Babr. G19b
T83				cf. Aus. G52

Aes.	**AaTh**	***TMI***	**Adrados**	**Van Dijk**
T85				cf. Quint. 18b; Theon, G20c; (Ps.-) Diogenian. G28; Hermog. G41; Aphth. G54; Nicol. G64a; Σ *in* Ar. G66a; Isid. G75
T86				A. 12F1
T87				cf. Arist. G5
T88				cf. Babr. G19b
T89				cf. (Ps.-)Diogenian. G28
T90				Chamael. G6, Hsch. G69b
T92				cf. Him. G56
T94				Arist. G5
T95				Babr. G19a
T96				cf. Phaedr. G13
T97				Quint. G18a
T98				Quint. G18b
T99				Gell. G31
T100				cf. Philostr. G42
T101				Hermog. G41
T102				cf. Aphth. G54
T103				cf. Theon, G20c
T104				cf. Nicol. G64a
T105				cf. Philostr. G42

2. *Index fabularum*

Characters	**Van Dijk**
Aesop and Bitch	Ar. 17F2
Aesop and Hermes	*ap.* Philostr. G42
Animals, Lion and Fox	see under "Fox"
Animals, Zeus and Men	see under "Zeus"
Ants and Cicadas	vv
Ape and Fox	Archil. 4F2a-c; Ar. 17A1; Pl. 49A2
Apes and Men	*ap.* Hermog. G41; Prisc. G70
Aphrodite, Man, Weasel and Mouse	see under "Weasel"
Apollo, Nymphs and Helicon	see under "Helicon"
Arrow and Eagle	vv
Ass in Lion's Skin	*ap.* Sopat. Rh. G58
Ass and Snake	Nic. 3F1; Ibyc. 8F1; Aristias 11F1; S. 14F1; Dinol. 16F1; Apolloph. 18F1; Chrysipp. Stoic. 56A1 (?)
Ass, Youth and Ass-Driver	see under "Youth"
Ass-Driver, Ass and Youth	see under "Youth"
Belly and Members	vv
Birds, Owl and Men	see under "Owl"
Bitch and Aesop	vv
Blackbird, Thrushes and Net	Arch. Antioch. 30F1
Boreas and Helios	vv

Characters	**Van Dijk**
Bramble, Olive and Laurel	see under "Laurel"
Bramble, Olive, Fig, Vine, and Trees	see under "Trees"
Bull, Momus and Poseidon	see under "Momus"
Bulls, Lion and Fox	*ap.* Them. G57
Butcher, Shepherd and Lamb	see under "Lamb"
Buzzard, Eel and Heron	see under "Heron"
Camel and Zeus	*ap.* Theon, G20c
Cat and Mice	*ap.* Phaedr. G15b
Cat and Moon	vv
Charybdis and Water	Arist. 57F1
Cicada and Fowler	vv
Cicadas and Ants	*ap.* Aphth. G54
City Mouse and Country Mouse	vv
Country Mouse and City Mouse	*ap.* Aug. G63; Prisc. G70; Isid. G75
Cow, Man and Earth	*ap.* Philostr. G42
Crab and Snake	*Scol.* 6F1
Craftsman and Hermes	vv
Crow and Scorpion	Arch. Mytil. 29F1
Cypriots and Pigeons	Timocr. 10F1
Demeter, Swallow and Eel	Demad. 41F1
Dog and Hare	Th. 32T1 (Σ)
Dog and Shadow	Democr. 47A1; *ap.* Theon, G20c; Sopat. Rh. G58
Dog, Sheep, Ewe and Master	see under "Ewe"
Dog and Wolf	vv
Dogs, Wolves and Sheep	see under "Sheep"
Dung Beetle, Hare and Eagle	Semon. 5F2 ?; Ar. 17F5, 17A2, 17A5
Eagle and Arrow	A. 12F1; Ar. 17A4
Eagle and Fox	vv
Eagle, Hare and Dung Beetle	see under "Dung Beetle"
Eagle, Serpent and Farmer	Stesich. 7F1; Crates Perg. 60F/A1
Eagle and Tortoise/Turtle	vv
Earth, Man and Cow	see under "Cow"
Eel, Demeter and Swallow	see under "Demeter"
Eel, Heron and Buzzard	see under "Heron"
Ewe, Sheep, Master, Dog	X. 50F1
Farmer, Eagle and Serpent	see under "Eagle"
Farmer, Son, Lark and Young	see under "Lark"
Father (Lark) and Lark	vv
Father, Maiden and Lion	see under "Lion"
Flute-Player and Fish	Hdt. 31F1
Fig, Olive, Vine, Bramble and Trees	see under "Trees"
Fish and Flute-Player	vv
Fisherman and Octopus	Simon. 9F1; Timocr. 10F2
Ford and Guide	vv
Fowler and Cicada	*ap.* Sopat. Rh. G58
Fox and Ape	vv
Fox and Eagle	Archil. 4F1a-h; Ar. 17A3
Fox (Dock-Tailed) and Other Foxes	Timocr. 10A1

Characters	Van Dijk
Fox, Lion and Animals	Pl. 49A1; *ap.* Quint. G18b
Fox, Lion and Bulls	see under "Bulls"
Fox, Shepherd, Lion and Stag	see under "Stag"
Fox, Ticks and Hedgehog	Arist. 39F2
Fox and Weasel	*ap.* Aug. G63; Isid. G75
Foxes (Other) and Dock-Tailed Fox	vv
Friend and Sybarite	vv
Gallus and Lion	Antip. Sid. 27F2
God, Pleasure and Pain	see under "Pleasure"
Guest and Man	vv
Guide and Ford	Pl. 49A3
Hare and Dog	vv
Hare, Dung Beetle and Eagle	see under "Dung Beetle"
Hares and Lions	vv
Hawk and Nightingale	Hes. 2F1; Aristarch. 59A1
Head and Man	vv
Hedgehog, Ticks and Fox	see under "Fox"
He-Goat and Vine	Leon. 26F1
Helicon, Nymphs and Apollo	*ap.* Him. G56
Helios and Boreas	S. 24A1; Hieronym. Rhod. 55A1
Hermes and Aesop	vv
Hermes and Craftsman	*ap.* Babr. G19c
Heron, Eel and Buzzard	Semon. 5F1
Horse, Stag and Man	Stesich. 7F2; Philist. 33F1 ?; Arist. 39F1
Insolence and War	vv
Jackdaw	Phld. 42A1ab
King's Son and Lion Cub	Phaedo 51F1ab
Lamb, Shepherd and Butcher	*ap.* Max. Tyr. G33
Lark and Her Father	Ar. 17F6; Theoc. 21A1 ?
Lark, Young, Farmer and Son	*ap.* Gell. G31
Laurel, Olive and Bramble	Call. 20F2; Ps.-Trypho 61A1
Lion Cub and King's Son	vv
Lion Cub and Man	A. 12F2; Ar. 17A6; [A.] 23A1
Lion, Fox and Animals	see under "Fox"
Lion, Fox and Bulls	see under "Bulls"
Lion, Fox, Shepherd and Stag	see under "Stag"
Lion and Gallus	vv
Lion, Maiden and Her Father	Hieronym. Hist. 37F1 ?; D.S. 38F1
Lion and Mouse	vv
Lions and Hares	Antisth. 48F1; Arist. 52A1
Lion's Skin and Ass	vv
Maiden, Her Father and Lion	see under "Lion"
Man, Cow and Earth	see under "Cow"
Man and Guest	Demetr. 43A1; Arist. 57A1
Man and Head	Carpyllides 28F1
Man (Middle-Aged) and Two Women	D.S. 38F2; *ap.* Sopat. Rh. G58
Man (Other), Man and Somebody	see under "Man"
Man, Other Man and Somebody	Antipho Soph. 45F1
Man, Weasel, Aphrodite and Mouse	see under "Weasel"

Characters	Van Dijk
Man and Lion Cub	vv
Man, Neighbours and Somebody	S. 13F2
Man, Prometheus and Momus	see under "Momus"
Man and Sailors	S. 13F1
Man, Stag and Horse	see under "Horse"
Master, Sheep, Ewe and Dog	see under "Ewe"
Members and Belly	*ap.* Liv. G11; Quint. G18b
Men, Animals and Zeus	see under "Zeus"
Men and Apes	vv
Men, Birds and Owl	see under "Owl"
Men and Muses	Pl. 49F2
Mice and Cat	vv
Momus, Poseidon and Bull	Arist. 57A2
Momus, Prometheus and Man	*Scol.* 6A1
Moon and Cat	Demetr. 43A2; auct. inc. 58F/A1
Mouse and Lion	*ap.* Mar. Victor. G47
Mouse and Weasel	Ar. 17F1
Mouse, Weasel, Aphrodite and Man	see under "Weasel"
Muses and Men	vv
Neighbours, Man and Somebody	see under "Man"
Net, Blackbird and Thrushes	see under "Blackbird"
Nightingale and Hawk	vv
Nymphs, Apollo and Helicon	see under "Helicon"
Octopus and Fisherman	vv
Olive, Laurel and Bramble	see under "Laurel"
Olive, Vine, Fig, Bramble and Trees	see under "Trees"
Owl, Birds and Men	*ap.* D.Chr. G23
Pain, Pleasure and God	see under "Pleasure"
Pigeons and Cypriots	vv
Pleasure, Pain and God	Pl. 49F1
Poseidon, Bull and Momus	see under "Momus"
Prometheus, Momus and Man	see under "Momus"
Sailors and Man	vv
Scorpion and Crow	vv
Serpent, Farmer and Eagle	see under "Eagle"
Shadow and Dog	vv
Sheep, Dogs and Wolves	Aristobul. 36F1; D. 40F1
Sheep, Ewe, Master and Dog	see under "Ewe"
Shepherd, Lamb and Butcher	see under "Lamb"
Shepherd, Stag, Lion and Fox	see under "Stag"
Snake and Ass	vv
Snake and Crab	vv
Somebody, Man and Neighbours	see under "Man"
Somebody, Man and Other Man	see under "Man"
Son, Farmer, Lark and Young	see under "Lark"
Stag, Horse and Man	see under "Horse"
Stag, Shepherd, Lion and Fox	54. Epicur. *ap.* Max. Tyr. G34
Swallow, Eel and Demeter	see under "Demeter"
Swallow and Viper	vv

Characters	**Van Dijk**
Sybarite and Friend	Ar. 17F2
Sybarite, Vase and Witness	Ar. 17F3
Thrushes, Blackbird and Net	see under Blackbird
Ticks, Fox and Hedgehog	see under "Fox"
Tortoise/Turtle and Eagle	Achae. 15A; Menedemus Eretr. 53A1
Tortoise and Zeus	Cerc. 22A1
Trees, Olive, Fig, Vine and Bramble	*ap.* Aug. G63; Isid. G75
Vase, Sybarite and Witness	see under "Sybarite"
Vine and He-Goat	vv
Vine, Olive, Fig, Bramble and Trees	see under "Trees"
Viper and Swallow	Antip. Sid. 27F1
War and Insolence	Theopomp. Hist. 35F1
Water and Charybdis	vv
Weasel and Fox	vv
Weasel, Man, Aphrodite and Mouse	Stratt. 19A1 ?
Weasel and Mouse	vv
Witness, Vase and Sybarite	see under "Sybarite"
Wolf and Dog	Archil. 4F3 ?
Wolves, Sheep and Dogs	see under "Sheep"
Women (Two) and Middle-Aged Man	vv
Young, Lark, Farmer and Son	see under "Lark"
Youth, Ass and Ass-Driver	D. 40F2
Zeus, Animals and Men	Call. 20F1
Zeus and Camel	vv
Zeus and Turtle	vv
unknown	Socr. 24A1
	Arist. 34F/A1

3. *Index locorum*[4]

Author	***locus***	**Van Dijk**
A.	fr. 139 Radt	12F1
	A. 717-736	12F2
[A.]	*AP* 10.110	23A1, Ar. 17T1
Abst.	*Praef.*	Stesich. 7T9, Hes. 2T43, Pl. 49T14, Arist. 52T1
Achae.	*TragGrF* I(Snell)20F34	15A1
A.D.	*Conj.* 224.2-3 Schneider	Archil. 4T12
Ael.	*NA* 6.51	Ibyc. 8T2, Aristias 11T1, S. 14T1, Dinol. 16T1, Apolloph. 18T1
	ib. 16.5	Ar. 17T12
	ib. 17.37	Stesich. 7T4, Crates Perg. 60T1
	fr. 22 Hercher	A. 12T9

[4] "Non-fables" and "non-allusions" are alphabetized in the Appendix.

Author	*locus*	Van Dijk
Agath.	*AP* 16.332	G71
Alcmaeon	*ap*. Isid. G75	44.
Alex. Aphr.	*in Mete*. 2.3	Arist. 57T2, G44
anon. gramm.	*An. Ox*. p. 171	Hes. 2T32a
	ib. 201	Hes. 2T32b
	ib. 209	Hes. 2T32c
anon. *Περὶ αἴνου*	(*PSI* 11, 1935, 1221)	G39, Timocr. 10T4, Ar. 17T10
anon. *Prol. Phil. Pl.*	2.7	G73
anon. *in Rh.*	2.20, 1393b8-17	Arist. 39T1ab, Stesich. 7T5ab
	ib. b23-26	Arist. 39T1cd
Antipho Soph.	87B54 Diels-Kranz	45F1
Author	*locus*	Van Dijk
Antip. Sid.	63 G-P, *AP* 7.210	27F1
	64 G-P, *AP* 6.219	27F2
Antisth.	fr. 100 Caizzi	48F1
Aphth.	*Prog.* 1	G54
APl	4.16	Socr. 25T2
Apollon.	*Lex. s.v.* ἄειδε	Call. 20T3
Apolloph.	fr. 9 *CAF*	18F1
Apostol.	*Praef.* 5	Hes. 2T41, Archil. 4T45-46ab, Call. 20T16
	1.50	Ar. 17T53
	7.28	Timocr. 10T6
	7.74	Ar. 17T60
	13.61a	Ar. 17T58b
	15.88a	A. 12T19
	17.69	D. 40T11
Ar.	*Ach.* 120	17A1
	Av. 471	G2
	ib. 472-475	17F6
	ib. 652-653	17A3
	ib. 807-808	17A4, A. 12T1
	Lys. 695	17A5
	Pax 127-134	17A2
	Ra. 1431-1432	17A6, A. 12T2, [A.] 23T1
	V. 566	G1a
	ib. 1182	17F1
	ib. 1183-1185	G1b
	ib. 1256-1261	G1c
	ib. 1393-1394	G1d
	ib. 1399-1405	17F2
	ib. 1427-1432	17F3
	ib. 1435-1440	17F4
	ib. 1448	17F5
Arch. Antioch.	24 G-P, *AP* 9.343	30F1

Author	locus	Van Dijk
Archil.	fr. 174-181 West	4F1a-h
	ib. 185-187	4F2a-c
	ib. 237	4F3
Arch. Mytil.	23 G-P, *AP* 9.339	29F1
Arist.	*Mete.* 2.3, 356b13-15	57F1
	Rh. 2.20, 1393a23-1394a18	G5
	ib.1393b8-22	39F1, Stesich. 7T1
	ib.1393b22-1394a1	39F2
	fr. 573 Rose	34F/A1
	HA 9.32, 619a18-20	57A1
	PA 3.2, 663a35-663b3	57A2
	Pol. 3.13, 1284a15-17	52A1, Antisth. 48T1
Aristarch.	*in* Hes. *Op.* 210-211	59A1, Hes. 2T1
Aristias	*TragGrF* I(Snell)9F8	11F1
Aristid.	*Or.* 2.55 (p. 161 Behr)	A. 12T7
	Or. 3.664 (p. 512 Behr)	Archil. 4T11
Arist. Lat. *anon.*		Stesich. 7T7, Arist. 39T2ab
Arist. Lat. *Guil.*		Stesich. 7T8, Arist. 39T3ab
Aristobul.	*FGrHist* 139F3	36F1, D. 40T1
Arsen.	1.69	Ar. 17T57
	23.62	Timocr. 10T7
	24.51	Ar. 17T58a
	41.21	Ar. 17T58b
	48.41	A. 12T19
	51.54	D. 40T12
Ath.	7.54, 299C	Semon. 5T2
	7.107, 318F	Simon. 9T2
	11.85, 494B	A. 12T10
	13.82, 604D-F	S. 24T2, Hieronym. Rhod. 55T1
	15.50, 694E	*Scol.* 6T1
	ib. 695A	*Scol.* 6T2
Attic.	fr. 2 DPl *ap.* Eus.*PE* 15.4.4-5	Archil. 4T13ab
Auct. ad Her.	1.6.10	G7
auct. inc.	*ap.* Demetr. *Eloc.* 158	58F/A1
Aug.	*c. mend. ad Consent.* 28	G63
	Cons. Evang. 1.12	Socr. 46T3
Aus.	*Ep.* 9 (Green)	G52
	ib. *Ep.* 12	G53
Avian.	*Praef.*	G59, Socr. 46T5
Babr.	*Prooem.* 1	G19a
	Prooem. 2	G19b
	119.11-12	G19c
Barb.	*Aes. fab. Praef.*	Pl. 49T13
Bas.	*Leg. lib. gent.* 9	Archil. 4T18
	Virt. 7	Archil. 4T19
Bocc.	*Geneal.* 14.9.36-38	Arist. 52T1
Call.	*Iamb.* 2(fr.192 Pf).1-15	20F1
	ib. 4 (fr. 194 Pf).6sqq	20F2

Author	***locus***	**Van Dijk**
Carpyllides	2 G-P, *AP* 9.52	28F1
Cerc.	fr. 7 Lomiento	22A1
Choer.	*epimer. in Ps.* (III 114 Gaisford)	Archil. 4T28, Call. 20T11
	in Theod. (p. 27 Hilgard)	Hes. 2T22a
	ib. 326	Hes. 2T33b
	ib. 328	Hes. 2T22c
	ib. 332	Hes. 2T22d
Chrysipp. Stoic.	fr. 180.14 *SVF*	56A1, Ibyc. 8T1
Cic.	*Att.* 5.10.3	17T2
	Inv. 1.17.25	G8
	De or. 2.66.264	G9
	Tusc. 1.41	17T3
Clem. Al.	*Strom.* 3.5 (42, 2)	Hes. 2T8
	ib. 5.14.127	Archil. 4T14
	ib. 5.8.48	Call. 20T6
	ib. 5.14.100	Call. 20T7
Cod. Paris. suppl. gr.	676 (p. 79 Cohn)	Simon. 9T3
Conon	*FGrHist*26F1(*Narr.*).42	Stesich. 7T3
Conr. Hirs.	*Dial. super Avian.* (p. 36 Schepss)	Alcmaeon 44T3
Crates Perg.	*ap.* Ael. *NA* 17.37	60F/A1, Stesich. 7T2
D.	fr. 13 Baiter-Sauppe	40F1
	ib. fr. 15	40F2
D.Chr.	55.10	G22, Archil. 4T6
	72.13	G23
	74.15	Archil. 4T7
Demad.	fr. 22 De Falco	41F1
Demetr.	*Eloc.* 157-158	G10
	ib. 157	43A1, Arist. 57T1
	ib. 158	43A2, auct. inc. 58T1
Democr.	68B224 Diels-Kranz	47A1
D.H.	*Dem.* 7	A. 12T3
Dieg.	6.22-32	Call. 20T9
	7.1-18	Call. 20T10
Dinol.	fr. 8 Kaibel	16F1
Diogenian.	V 1.65	Ar. 17T9a
	2.44	Ar. 17T9b
D.L.	2.5 (42)	Socr. 25T1
	2.17 (133)	Achae. 15T2, Menedemus Eretr. 53T1
Doxap.	*Comm. in Aphth.* (II 143 W)	Hes. 2T27a
	ib. 144	Hes. 2T27b
	ib. 147	Hdt. 31T2, Th. 32T2
	ib. 149	Hes. 2T27c
	ib. 165-166	Hom. 1T5, Hes. 2T27d, Archil. 4T32
D.S.	19.25.5-6	38F1, Hieronym. Hist. 37T1?
	33.7.6	38F2

Author	locus	Van Dijk
EM	α 462 L-L	Archil. 4T38
	ib. 513	Hes. 2T35a
	ib. 1463	Hes. 2T35b
	s.v. ζωΐδιον	Semon. 5T5
	s.v. ἱέραξ	Hes. 2T35c
	s.v. σκανδάληθρον	Archil. 4T39
Enn.	*Sat. inc.* II 21-58 Vahlen	*ap.* Gell. G31
Epicur.	*ap.* Max. Tyr. G34	54.
Epim. in Hom.	(p. 238 Cramer)	Hes. 2T24
Erasm.	*Adag.* 1.1.68	Arch. Mytil. 29T2
	ib. 1.3.52	D. 40T13
	ib. 1.5.74	Pl. 49T15, Arist. 57T4
	ib. 1.7.68	Achae. 15T3, Menedemus Eretr. 53T2
	ib. 2.2.82	Ar. 17T61
	ib. 2.3.77	A. 12T20, Ar. 17T62
	ib. 2.6.27	Ar. 17T63a
	ib. 3.3.67	Ar. 17T63b
	ib. 3.7.1 (p. 869)	Ar. 17T64a
	ibid. (p. 883)	Ar. 17T64b
	Cop. 2 (p. 254 Knott)	Hes. 2T44
Erot.	σ 25 (p. 79 Nachmanson)	Archil. 4T2
Et. Gen.	α 187 Lasserre-Livadaras	Archil. 4T29
	ib. 215	Hes. 2T23a
	ib. 672	Nic. 3T3
	ib. 926	Hes. 2T23b
	sv ζῷον	Semon. 5T4
Et. Gud.	*s.v.* αἶνος (p. 48 De Stefani)	Hes. 2T33, Archil. 4T33a, 4T34, Call. 20T12
	ib. p. 49	Archil. 4T33b
Et. Sym.	α 256 Lasserre-Livadaras	Archil. 4T40
	ib. 285	Hes. 2T36
Eun.	*Hist.* fr. 87	Hes. 2T12
Eus.	*PE* 13.13.23	Call. 20T8
	ib. 13.13.54	Archil. 4T17a
	ib. 15.4.4-5	Archil. 4T17bc
Eust.	*Il.* A 80	Hes. 2T29a
	ibid. 113	Hes. 2T29b
	ib. Z 168-170	A. 12T15
	ib. Λ 430	Hes. 2T29cd, Archil. T35, Call. 20T13
	ib. Σ 505	Hes. 2T29e
	ib. Ψ 795	Hes. 2T29f
	ib. Ω 317-319	Ar. 17T38
	Od. α 398	Hes. 2T30a
	ib. η 125	*Scol.* 6T3ab
	ib. μ 85	Hes. 2T30b

Author	locus	Van Dijk
(Eust.)	ib. ξ 508	Hes. 2T30c, Archil. 4T36-37ab, Call. 20T14
Eust. Antioch.	*Engast.* 29	G46
Eutecn.	*in Ther.* 343-358	Nic. 3T2
fab. aes.	63 Hausrath	Demad. 41T1
Fortun.	*Rhet.* 2.23	G48
Gal.	*Plac. Hipp. et Pl.* 4.5.17	A. 12T8
	Simp. med. temp. 11.37	Ar. 17T11, Theoc. 21T1
Gell.	2.29.1	G31
gloss. Cod. Gal.	*ad Op.* 208-210	Hes. 2T39ab
Greg. Cor.	*Dial.* 66 (p. 475 Schaefer)	Hes. 2T34
Greg. Cypr.	1.57	Ar. 17T39a
	M 1.55	Ar. 17T39b
Hdn.	*Περὶ ὀρθογραφίας* (p. 516 Lentz)	Semon. 5T1
	Περὶ τῶν εἰς μι (p. 828 Lentz)	Hes. 2T7
	Philet. 2	Ar. 17T13
Hdt.	1.141.1-2	31F1
Herenn. Ph.	fr. 32 Palmieri	G27, Hes. 2T6, Archil. 4T8-9bc, Call. 20T4
Herm.	*in Phdr.* 258e-259d	Pl. 49T6a-g
	ib. 272c	Pl. 49T7
Hermog.	*Prog.* 1	G41, Hes. 2T9, Archil.4T15
Hes.	*Op.* 202-212	2F1
Hieronym. Hist.	*ap.* D.S. 19.25.5-6 ?	37F1
Hieronym. Rhod.	fr. 35 Wehrli	55A1, S. 24T1
Him.	*Or.* 46.4-5	G55
	Or. 66	G56
Hom.	*ap.* Theon. G21c, Philostr. G44	1.
Hor.	*Ep.* 1.1.73-75	*ap.* Quint. G18b
	ib. 1.7.29-33	*ap.* Aug. G63; Isid. G75
	S. 2.6.79-117	*ap.* Aug. G63; Prisc. G70; Isid. G75
Hsch.	α 2159 Latte	G69a
	λ 946 Latte	G69b
	μ 1805 Latte	G69c
	σ 2131 Schmidt	G69d
Hypoth. Isoc.	1	Hes. 2T19
Iamb.	*in Phdr.* fr. 7 Dillon	Pl. 49T3
Ibyc.	61, fr. 342 *PMG*; 32, fr. 313 *PMG* (?)	8F1
Isid.	*Etym.* 1.40	G75, D. 40T7, Alcmaeon 44T1
Iul. Vict.	*Rhet.* 6.3	G49
Jo. Sard.	*in Aphth.* (p. 8 Rabe)	Hom. 1T4, Hes. 2T25 (*coniect.*), Archil. 4T31
Jul.	*Or.* 7.3, 207a-d	G50, Hes. 2T11 ?, Archil. 4T20

Author	***locus***	**Van Dijk**
(Jul.)	*Or.* 10, 306c	G51
lemm. ad AP	6.219	Antip. Sid. 27T3
	7.210	Antip. Sid. 27T4
	9.52	Carpyllides 28T1
	ib.99	Leon. 26T1
	ib.339	Arch. Mytil. 29T1
	ib.343	Arch. Antioch. 30T1
Leon.	32 G-P, *AP* 9.99	26F1
Leonardo Dati	40 (pp. 298-299 Tacke)	Demad. 41T2
Liv.	2.32.9	G11
Luc.	*VH* 2.18	G32
Luc. Tarrh.	fr. 1 Linnenkugel	G21, Hes. 2T4, Archil. 4T4-5ab, Call. 20T2
LXX	*Jd.* 9.8-15	*ap.* Aug. G63; Isid. G75
Macar.	1.36	Ar. 17T51
	6.71	A. 12T18, Ar. 17T52
Macr.	*Comm.* 1.2.7-11	G60
	ib. 5.16.6	Hes. 2T13
Mantiss. prov.	1.2	Ar. 17T59
	2.54	Ar. 17T60
Mart. Cap.	5.49 (558)	G62
Mar. Victor.	*Rhet.* 1.17	G47
Max. Tyr.	19.2	G33
	32.1	G34
	ib.1-2	Epicur. 54T1
	36	G35
Melanchthon	*Util. fab.*	Hom. 1T6, Hes. 2T45, D. 40T14
Menedemus Eretr.	*ap.* D.L. 2.17 (133)	53A1, Achae. 15T1
Men. Prot.	*Exc. de sent.* fr. 35a Müller	Hes. 2T21
Moschop.	*in Op.* 200-210	Hes. 2T38a-d
Nic.	*Ther.* 343-358	3F1
Nicol.	*Prog.* 1	G64a
	Prog. 2	G64b
	Prog. 3	G64c
	Prog. 4.3	Hes. 2T14
Olymp.	*in Alc.* 122b-124a	Pl. 49T12a-c
	in Grg. 49.3	G72
	in Mete. 1.14, 352a17	Arist. 57T3
Ph.	*Aet. M.* 49	A. 12T4
Phaedo	*Zopyr.* fr. 1 Rossetti	51F1ab
Phaedr.	1.*Prol.*	G12
	2.*Prol.*	G13
	3.*Prol.*	G14
	4.*Prol.*11-13	G15a
	4.2.1-7	G15b
	5.*Prol.*	G16
Philist.	*FGrHist* 556F6	33F1

Author	*locus*	Van Dijk
Philostr. (II)	*VA* 5.14-16	G42
Philostr. (II/III ?)	*Im.* 1.3	G43, Hom. 1T3, Hes. 2T10, Archil. 4T16
Phld.	*Rh.* 2, fr. 3.11-12 (p.68 S)	42A1a
	ibid.25-27	42A1b
Phot.	*Bibl.* 186, 139b	Stesich. 7T6
	ib. 248, 437b	Archil. 4T30
	ib. 265, 495a15-30	D. 40T8
	Lex. s.v. ὄνου σκιά	D. 40T9
Pl.	*Phd.* 60c	49F1
	ib. 60c-61b	G3, Socr. 46T1
	Phdr. 259b-d	49F2
	Alc. I 123a	49A1
	Tht. 200e	49A3
	R. 2.8, 365c4-6	49A2, Archil. 4T1
Plu.	*Alc.* 16.3	A. 12T5, Ar. 17T5
	Dem. 23.4-6	Aristobul. 36T1, D. 40T2
	Mor. 14E	G24a
	ib. 16C	Socr. 46T2
	ib. 16BC	G24b
	ib. 152D	G25a
	ib. 158B	G25b, Hes. 2T5
	ib. 162BC	G25c
	ib. 164B	G25d
	ib. 871D	G26
	Them. 21.7	Timocr. 10T1
	Mor. 848AB	D. 40T3
PMich.	6	G45
Prisc.	*Praeex.* 1	G70, Hes. 2T20, Archil. 4T22
Procl.	vide Σ *in* Hes.	
	vide Σ *in* Pl.	
Ps.-Ammon.	*Diff.* 18 (pp. 5-6 Nickau)	Hes. 2T40, Archil. 4T43-44ab, Call. 20T15
(Ps.-)Diogenian.	*Praef.*	G28, Hom. 1T2, Archil. 4T10, Simon. 9T1, Timocr. 10T2-3, A. 12T6, Ar. 17T8, Call. 20T5,
Psel.	*Orat.* 25.169-174 Littlewood	Socr. 46T6
(Ps.-?)Ptol. Ascal.	sv αἶνος καὶ παροιμία	G37
Ps.-Zonar.	*Lex. s.v.* αἶνος	Hes. 2T37
	ib. *s.v.* Ζῷον	Semon. 5T6
Quint.	*Inst.* 1.9.1-3	G18a
	ib. 5.11.19-21	G18b, Hes. 2T2
	ib. 6.3.44	G18c
Rom.	*Praef.* 1	G74a
	Praef. 2	G74b

Author	*locus*	Van Dijk
(Rom.)	26a Thiele	G74c
Rom. Vind.	*Epil.*	Alcmaeon 44T2
S.	*Aj.* 1142-1146	13F1
	ib. 1150-1156	13F2
	Κωφοί, fr. 362 Radt	14F3
	fr. 4 West	24A1
Σ *in* Aphth.	1.11 (II 570 W)	Hes. 2T28
	(II 10 Walz)	Hdt. 31T3
Σ *in* Ar.	*Ach.* 120	Archil. 4T23, Ar. 17T14
	ib. 279	Archil. 4T24
	Av. 15	Ar. 17T15
	ib. 471a-475c	Ar. 17T16a-l
	ib. 471b	G66a, Arist. 34T1
	ib. 651b	G66b, Archil. 4T25, Ar. 17T17a
	ib. 652-653	Ar. 17T17bc
	ib. 807a-808d	A. 12T11a-d, Ar. 17T18a-d
	Lys. 694ab	Ar. 17T19ab
	Pac. 129a-134b	Ar. 17T20a-c
	Ra. 1432	Ar. 17T21
	V. 191d	Ar. 17T22
	ib. 1182a	G67a, Ar. 17T23a
	ib. 1182b	Ar. 17T23b
	ib. 1259a	G67b
	ib. 1403-1405	Ar. 17T24ab
	ib. 1428-1432	Ar. 17T25a-f
	ib. 1436a-1440a	Ar. 17T26a-c
	ib. 1446-1448	Ar. 17T27ab
	(Ald) *Pac.* 134a	Ar. 17T55
	V. 1436b-1440c	Ar. 17T56a-c
Σ *in* E.	*Hec.* 678	Hes. 2T16
Σ *in* Hes. (Procl. ?)	*in Op.* 202-213a	Hes. 2T17a-l
	ibid. 207-212	Aristarch. 59T1
Σ *in Il.*	18.407*b*	Semon. 5T3
	19.407	G36, Hes. 2T18,
	Cod. Reg. 3058, III 371 Cramer	Hes. 2T42, Archil. 4T47-48ab, Call. 20T17
Σ *in* Luc.	*Herm.* 71	D. 40T5
Σ *in* Nic.	*Ther.* 343-354	S. 14T2
	ib. 343-355a	Nic. 3T1a-k
Σ *in Od.*	14.508	G68, Archil. 4T27
Σ *in* Pl.	(Procl. ?) *in Alc.* I 123a	Pl. 49T8
	Phdr. 260c	D. 40T6
	Phdr. 259b-260c	Pl. 49T9a-d
	ib. 272c	Pl. 49T10
	Tht. 200E	Pl. 49T11
Σ *in* S.	*Aj.* 1150-1156b	S. 13T2a-f
Σ *in* Th.	4.92.2	Th. 32T1

Author	***locus***	**Van Dijk**
Σ *in* Theoc.	7.23d-f	Theoc. 21T2ab
Scol.	9, fr. 892 *PMG*	6F1
	6, fr. 889 *PMG*	6A1
Semon.	fr. 9 West	5F1
	fr. 13 West	5F2
Sen.	*Polyb. Cons.* 8.3-4	G17
Simon.	9, fr. 514 *PMG*	9F1
Socr.	fr. [1] West	25F1
	ap. Pl. *Phd.* 60c-61b, Plu. *Mor.* 16C, Avian. G60, Syn. *Dion.* 15, Aug. *Cons. Evang.* 1.12, Psel. *Orat.* 25.169-174 Littlewood	46.
Sopat. Rh.	*Prog.*	G58
Stesich.	103, fr. 280 *PMG*	7F1
	104(a), fr. 281 *PMG*	7F2
Stob.	1.3.34	Archil. 4T21
	3.4.3	Hes. 2T15
	3.10.68	Democr. 47T1
	3.16.30	Antipho Soph. 45T1a
	4.16.7	Cerc. 22T1
	4.40.19	Antipho Soph. 45T1b
Strattis	fr. 71 Kock	19A1
Suda	α 230 Adler	Hes. 2T26
	ibid. 687	Antip. Sid. 27T1a
	ibid. 1470	Ar. 17T28a
	ibid. 1510	Antip. Sid. 27T2a
	ibid. 1828	Antip. Sid. 27T2b
	ibid. 4172	Antip. Sid. 27T2c
	ib. αι 335	Ar. 17T29a
	ib. ε 747	Antip. Sid. 27T2d
	ibid. 2289	Ar. 17T30
	ibid. 2913	Ar. 17T31a
	ibid. 3246	Antip. Sid. 27T1b
	ib. ει 26	Ar. 17T31b
	ibid. 64	A. 12T13a, Ar. 17T32a
	ib. η 251	Antip. Sid. 27T1c
	ibid. 525	Antip. Sid. 27T1d
	ib. κ 1654	Antip. Sid. 27T1e
	ibid. 2544	Antip. Sid. 27T2e
	ib. λ 869	Antip. Sid. 27T2f
	ib. ο 400	D. 40T10a
	ib. ο 986	A. 12T14a, Ar. 17T33a
	ibid. 992	A. 12T13b
	ib. π 3	A. 12T13c
	ibid. 783	Ar. 17T28b
	ib. σ 299	Antip. Sid. 27T2g
	ibid. 713	A. 12T14b, Ar. 17T33b
	ib. 829	Socr. 25T3
	ibid. 1723	Antip. Sid. 27T2h

Author	*locus*	Van Dijk
(*Suda*)	ib. τ 183	A. 12T13d
	ibid. 390	Antip. Sid. 27T1f
	ibid. 953	Ar. 17T31c
	ib. υ 327	D. 40T10b
Suet.	*Rhet.* 1 (25.4)	G30
Symm. (I)	*in* Ar. *Av.* 440	Ar. 17T6
Symm. (II)	*Ep.* 1.32	Aus. G53
Syn.	*Dion* 15	Socr. 46T4
	Ep. 5.80	S. 13T1
	Insomn. 19, 154D-155A	G61
Tat.	*Orat.* 34	G38
Th.	*ap.* Σ *in* 4.92.2	32.
Thdr. Stud.	*Ep.* 2.162	A. 12T12
Them.	*Or.* 21, 246a	Pl. 49T5
	Or. 22, 278c	G57
Theoc.	7.23	21A1
Theon	*Prog.* 1	G20a
	ib. 2	G20b, Hdt. 31T1, Philist. 33T1, Theopomp. Hist. 35T1, X. 50T1
	ib. 3	G20c, Hom. 1T1, Hes. 2T3a-c, Archil. 4T3, Pl. 49T1, Phaedo 51T1ab
Theopomp. Hist.	*FGrHist*115F127	35F1
Theo Sm.	(p. 73 Hiller)	G29
Tim.	*Lex.* sv ἀλωπεκῆν	Pl. 49T4
Timocr.	4, fr. 730 *PMG*	10F1
	8, fr. 734 *PMG*	10F2
	3(fr. 729 *PMG*).4-5	10A1
Tricl.	*in* Ar. *Ach.* 120	Archil. 4T41, A. 17T40
	ib. 279	Archil. 4T42
	in A. 717-736	A. 12T20a-uu
	in Av. 471b	Arist. 34T2
	ibid. b-d	Ar. 17T41a-g
	ib. 651ab	Ar. 17T38ab
	ib. 807b-808b	A. 12T21a-d, Ar. 17T43a-c
	in Pac. 129-134b	Ar. 17T44ab
	in V. 191d	Ar. 17T45
	ib. 1182ab	Ar. 17T46ab
	ib. 1401-1405	Ar. 17T47a-c
	ib. 1427-1432	Ar. 17T48a-f
	ib. 1436a-1440b	Ar. 17T49a-d
	ib. 1446-1448	Ar. 17T50ab
Trypho	*Trop.* 2.24	61A1, Call. 20T1
Tz.	*in Op.* 200	Aristarch. 59T2
	ibid. 200-211	Hes. 2T31a-d
	in Av. 475	Ar. 17T34
	ib. 652-653	Ar. 17T35

Author	***locus***	**Van Dijk**
(Tz.)	ib. 808	Ar. 17T36
	in Ra. 1431-1432	Ar. 17T37ab
Val. Max.	7.2.ext.7	Ar. 17T4
Vit. Aesop.	1GW	G40a
	7GW	G40b
	100GW	G40c
X.	*Mem.* 2.7.13-14	50F1
Zen.	1.20	Ar. 17T7
	2.93	Stratt. 19T1
	6.28	D. 40T4, Pl. 49T2
	cod. Mon. 525 (I 166 Bühler)	Timocr. 10T5

NON-FABLES & NON-ALLUSIONS[1]

Introduction

The Appendix lists passages which others consider to be fables or allusions to fables but the present author does not. *A priori* and obviously, everything absent from the above Synopsis is (in the present writer's view) neither fable nor allusion. Nevertheless, the elusive definition and the terminological polysemy of the genre (see above, Part I) make this Appendix necessary.

Many passages which are said to be fables lack one of the genre's commonly accepted characteristics, notably its metaphorical (but not totally allegorical!) or narrative character. The absence of the latter has been seen (in the Synthesis above) to be typical of comparisons, similes, metaphors, omens, and proverbs; the absence (or lesser degree) of the former to be typical of myths, legends, anecdotes, exempla, and fairy tales; the absence of both to be typical of natural history and personal satire.

Problematic though the identification of allusions to fables may at times be (due to their very nature, as defined in the Synthesis above, and in view of the many transitions from fables to related (sub)genres and other forms of imagery, and *vice versa*), the frequent occurrence of simple, "fable-less", comparisons, similes, metaphors, and proverbs, has to be allowed for also. To put it differently, fable scholars must resist the temptation to look for a fable behind every fox.

To facilitate the use of this Appendix, the passages are arranged alphabetically. Each lemma consists of four parts, which can be schematized as follows: "a (contra X): b ((cf.) Y)", in which "a" represents a particular passage; "X" the author(s) considering or suggesting it to be a fable, or an allusion to a fable, or to be about fables in general; "b" the genre in which the present author would include it; "Y" (an)other author(s) making the same or a comparable distinction.

[1] For the definition of testimonies, excluding passages referring only to the *context* of fables and allusions, see the General Introduction above, n. 29.

As a rule, this Appendix does not enter into every detail, in order to keep within reasonable limits.

Besides Archaic, Classical, and Hellenistic Greek non-fables and non-allusions, two types of passages from the Imperial period and from Latin literature have been included as well, viz., first, non-fables and non-allusions occurring in *spuria* (e.g. Ps.-Callisth.), and, secondly, passages which are falsely alleged to deal with fable as a genre, and which, had they done so, would have been discussed in Part I above.

Achaeus

Achae. (contra Neubner 1889, 34): the deduction from Athenaeus' characterization (10.74, 451C) of Achaeus' style as obscure and enigmatical (αἰνιγματωδῶς), that (in addition to 15A1) "etiam pluribus locis ab illo apologos tecte significatos esse", cannot be ascertained.

Aeschylus

A. *A.* 109-125 (contra Cascajero 1992, 55; cf. Adrados 1987a, 281-282): omen (cf. Scott, W.C., "Wind Imagery in the *Oresteia*", *TAPhA* 97, 1966, 462-463; Sommerstein, A.H., "Aeschylus, *Agamemnon* 126-130", *CR* 21, 1971, 1-3 (reply by Woolley, A., ib. 24, 1974, 1-2); Lawrence, S.E., Artemis in the *Agamemnon*", *AJPh* 97, 1976, 97-110), showing *influence* from Archil. 4F1 (Adrados 1964 and 1979a, 156, 205-206, 258; West 1979; Arnott, W.G., "The Eagle Portent in the *Agamemnon*: An Ornithological Footnote", *CQ* 29, 1979, 7-8; Janko, R., "Aeschylus' *Oresteia* and Archilochus", *CQ* 30, 1980, 291-293; Davies 1981, 258-251; Gantz 1983, 72-75);

ib. 357-361 (contra Lloyd-Jones' suggestion (1969, 98-99); cf. Davies 1981, 250-251): metaphor (cf. Dumortier 1935, 8, 76; Denniston-Page 1957, 361; Hogan 1984, 52), which is *comparable* with Babr. 4 (*Aes.* 282; cf. Adrados 1979a, 156);

ib. 1224: see above, A. 12F2, n. 44;

ib. 1258-1259 (contra Wærn 1951, 130; Davies 1981, 251): metaphor (cf. Hogan 1984, 93; above, A. 12F2, n. 44);

ib. 1624: same proverb (cf. Zen. 5.70) as Pi. *P.* 2.94-95 (q.v.);
Ch. 749sqq: see above, A. 12F2, n. 44;
Eu. 193: see above, A. 12F2, n. 44;
ib. 355-356: see above, A. 12F2, n. 44;
fr. 233 Radt *ap.* Σ *in* Ar. *Pac.* 73b (see above, Ar. 17A2, n. 112) (contra Crusius 1890, 34: reference to huge Etnean beetle derives from (alleged) natural history, not from *Aes.* 3 (e.g. Semon. 5F2; Ar. 17F5, 17A2, 17A5));
fr. 207 Radt *ap.* Plu. *Mor.* 86EF (*Aes.* 467; cf. Epiph. *Ancor.* 106.2), Eust. *Il.* Γ 277 (contra Adrados 1987a, 405; Jedrkiewicz 1989, 366; Cascajero 1992, 61): τράγος is not "as the he-goat [of the fable]" (cf. Perry's translation (1965, 518)), but *nominativus pro vocativo* (common in satyr plays, as my colleague Willeon Slenders points out to me): "you, he-goat [satyr]" (cf. Babbitt's translation (F.C., *Plutarch. Moralia*, II, Loeb, 1928 (repr. 1992), 9)), as Eustathius explains (cf. Epiphan. lc; Bates 1934, 170-171, who tentatively ascribes the fragment to S. (*Κωφοί*)).

[Aesopus][2]

[Aesop.] *AP* 10.123 (contra Espino's suggestion (1942, 10-11): general lamentation, not reference to any particular pro- or epimythium (Crusius, O., "Das Epigramm des Aesop", *Philologus* 52 (*n.s.* 6), 1894, 202-204).

Alcaeus

Alc. (contra De Furia 1810, p. XXI; Vürtheim 1919, 76): no fables to be found (cf. Dressel 1876, 21);
fr. 130 Lobel-Page (contra Bowra's suggestion (1961, 146, 426)): too uncertain (cf. Campbell 1982-1993, I 303);
see also above, *Scol.* 6F1, n. 108.

[2] Page 1981, 107 contra Paton (1916-1918, IV 62-63, 420).

Alcaeus Mess.

Alc. Mess. 21 Gow-Page, *AP* 6.218 (*et ap. Sudam*, svv α 388 (1), π 2954 (2), θ 526, π 952 (3-4), ω 89 (5-6), τ 316 (7-8) Adler): same theme (9 εἵσατο (for which see Gow-Page 1965, 26); *lemm. ad loc.* εἰς τὸ αὐτό) as [Simon.] 59 Page (2 Gow-Page), *AP* 6.217 (q.v.).

Alcman

Alcm. (contra Hausrath 1909, col. 1707; Jedrkiewicz 1989, 325; Traversa 1991, 267; cf. Keller 1861-1867, 382): misinterpretation of Ael. *NA* 12.3 and corruption of "*Alcmeon*" *ap.* Isid. G75 (Alcmaeon 44T1; q.v.) (Achelis 1920-1924, 110, n. 3 contra Grauert 1825, 79; Campbell 1982-1993, II 447, usefully comparing Alcm. fr. 25 *ap.* Σ Bern. *ad* Verg. *G.* 3.89).

Alexis

Alex. *Αἴσωπος*, fr. 9 *PCG ap.* Ath. 10.38, 431d-f (*Aes.* T33) (contra Jedrkiewicz's suggestion (1989, 364-365); cf. Keller 1861-1867, 383, n. 97): it cannot be ascertained whether his comedy contained any fables[3] (cf. Grauert 1825, 29, using "fabula" for "play", not "fable"; Arnott, W.G., *Alexis. The Fragments*, Cambridge: UP 1996, 75-76).

Anacharsis

Anach. *ap.* Stob. 3.18.25 (contra Adrados 1985, 355): variant of myth in Panyas. fr. 13 Davies (q.v.).

---

[3] One might compare four extant modern comedies (Edme Boursault's 1690 *Esope*, its 1701 sequel *Esope à la Cour*, Eustache Le Noble's 1691 *Esope*, and John Vanbrugh's 1697 *Æsop*), whose protagonists do tell various fables. See Plessow 1906, p. LXXVIII; Patterson 1991, 147; Brunon, J.-C., "La fable en comédie au temps de La Fontaine: *Les fables d'Ésope* de Boursault et l'*Ésope* de Le Noble", in: Bideaux *et al.* 1992, 149-170; Shapiro 1992, 49-50, 53; Parussa 1993, 88-90, 124; Lewis 1996, 1, 190 n. 1.

Anacreon

Anacr. fr. 413 *PMG ap.* Heph. *Ench.* 12.4 (contra Bowra 1961, 290-291): metaphor.

Antipater of Sidon

Antip. Sid. 22 Gow-Page, *AP* 7.172 (contra Setti 1890, 32; Waltz 1906a, 33, n. 3: "cf. Fontanum nostratem"): (pseudo-)epitaph, apparently inspired by Pl. *Tht.* 174a (q.v.; Gow Page 1965, II 51; cf. Adrados 1985, 341);
for *AP* 9.76, see above, Arch. Mytil. 29F1, n. 53.

[Aphthonius]

[Aphth.] *Praef. fab. Aes.* (*Aes.* T1) (contra Marc 1910, 411; Jedrkiewicz 1989, 54): attribution to (time of) Aphthonius based upon misunderstanding of *editio princeps* (together with Aphth. *Prog.* (cf. G54)) by Commelinus (Leiden 1597), nor in accordance with MS tradition (Perry 1936, 163-173, 230: "13th cent."; 1952, 211 n. 1, 310; but cf. 1959, 33).

Archilochus

Archil. fr. 22 Lasserre: see below, under fr. 49 West;
fr. 23 West (contra Burnett 1983, 75; Campbell 1983, 120; Cascajero 1991, 22, n. 25; cf. Kamerbeek, J.C., "Archilochea", *Mnemosyne, s. IV*, 14, 1961, 12; Lasserre 1984, 64): comparison[4] (cf. Morel, W., "Die Ameise bei Archilochus", *ZPE* 8, 1971, 143-144; Gallavotti, C., "I Giambi di P. Oxy. 2310 attribuiti ad Archiloco", *Philologus* 119, 1975, 157; Slings, S.R., "Archilochus and the Ant", *ZPE* 45, 1982, 69-70; id. 1983a; Bodson 1987, 57), not allusion to *fab. aes.* 176 Hausrath (*Aes.* 235);
fr. 25 Lasserre: see below, under fr. 49 West;
frr. 35, 37 West: see below, under fr. 126;

[4] Differently Lobel *ap.* Giordano, D., "P. Oxy. 2310", *Aegyptus* 37, 1957, 216: "proberbio" (cf. Latte, K., *Gnomon* 27, 1955, 494; Lasserre, F., "Un nouveau poème d'Archiloque", *MH* 13, 1956, 230); Schiassi, G., "De novo Archilocho (Oxy. Pap. 2310,1)", *RFIC* 85, 1957, 151-166, taking Myrmex as a proper name.

frr. 48 Lasserre (*ex* Hdn., 2.384 Lentz), 272 (*ap.* Σ *in* Il. Z 507), 274 West (*ap.* Σ *in* Ar. *Pl.* 476), 51 Lasserre-Bonnard (*ex* Const. Rhod., 2.629 Matranga) (contra Lasserre-Bonnard 1958, 19; Jedrkiewicz 1989, 314-315): connection with *fab. aes.* 44 Hausrath (*Aes.* 44) or with other fable (Nøjgaard 1964, 450) extremely speculative (cf. below, n. 4);

frr. 49.7+73, 296 West, 22 Lasserre, 265 West, 25 Lasserre, 217, 65+67+216 West: connection with Archil. 4F3 speculative (see above, Archil. 4F3, n. 86);

fr. 51 Lasserre-Bonnard: see above, under fr. 48 Lasserre;

frr. 65, 67, 73 West: see above, under fr. 49;

fr. 78 Lasserre (contra Lasserre-Bonnard 1958, 24: "Le mot d'écrevisse (v. 3) suggère une fable, à la rigueur"): remnants καρκ[ίνος scant (οὐ]κ ἀρκ[εῖ μοι);

fr. 95 Lasserre/232 Adrados: see below, under *iamb. adesp.* 33 Diehl;

frr. 114 (*ap.* Gal., 18.604 Kühn), 117 (*ap.* Σ *in Il.* Ω 81), 233 West (*ap.* Plu. *Mor.* 503A) (contra suggestion Lasserre-Bonnard 1958, 30 *ad* frr. 92-93 and 63 *ad* fr. 221): connection with *fab. aes.* 76 Hausrath (*Aes.* 74) speculative; the same applies to Adrados' tentative connection (1979a, 413; followed by Cascajero 1991, 22, n. 25) of fr. 117 with *fab. aes.* 174 Hausrath (*Aes.* 165);

fr. 117 West: see above, under fr. 114;

frr. 126 (*ap.* Poll. 6.187), 37 (*ap.* Porph. *ad* Il. I 90), 35 (*ap.* *Et. Gen.*, *Et. Gud.*, *EM* sv κορωνός) West (contra Hausrath 1909, col. 1706; Lasserre-Bonnard 1958, 10-11; Adrados 1987a, 227 and 1990, I 56-57; cf. Rutherford 1883, XXXI; Lasserre 1984, 63; Jedrkiewicz 314, n. 34): connection with *fab. aes.* 235 Hausrath (cf. eund. *ad loc.*; *Aes.* 215) speculative (cf. Denis 1883, 231, n. 2; Nøjgaard 1964, 450);

fr. 184 West: see above, Archil. 4F2, n. 73;

frr. 188 (*ap.* Heph. 5.3, 6.3, 7.4, 15.8) + 329 (*ap.* *Et. Gen.* sv ἀθῷος, *EM* ibid.) West (contra Keller's suggestion (1861-1867, 383)): difficult to see how these could be "Reste einer Krähenfabel";

fr. 196a.39-41 West: allusion to same proverb (Burkert 1984, 113) as Ar. *Pax* 1079 (q.v.);

fr. 201 West (contra Keller 1861-1867, 383; Dressel 1876, 20; Neubner 1889, 7, n. 1; Dähnhardt 1912, 90; Bowra 1940; Klinger 1948/1949, 47; Megas 1960, 206; id. 1978, 4-5; Schwarzbaum 1979, p. XLII n. 41, 462; Villemonteix 1991, 147-148; cf. Stanford 1942, 46; Jedrkiewicz 1989, 323-324; West *ad loc.*): see

above, 1. Homer (*Marg.* fr. 5 West) (cf. Denis 1883, 231-232, n. 2; Campbell 1967, 160; Bodson 1987);
frr. 203, 255, 312-313, 329 West: see above, Archil. 4F1, n. 41;
fr. 216-217 West: see above, under fr. 49;
fr. 223 West (*ap.* Luc. *Pseud.* 1; cf. Leo, *An. Gr.* p. 557 Matranga; Const. Rhod. ib. 628) (contra Puelma 1972, 91, n. 25; West 1978b, 4; Jedrkiewicz 1989, 231, n. 27): metaphor (cf. Hendrickson, G.L., "Archilochus and Catullus", *CPh* 20, 1925, 155; Adrados 1955, 14-15; Bodson 1987, 57; Bossi 1990, 226-234);
fr. 224 West: see above, Archil. 4F1, n. 41;
fr. 225 West: see above, Archil. 4F2, n. 73;
fr. 232 Adrados: see above, under fr. 95 Lasserre;
fr. 232 West: see above, Archil. 4F2, n. 73;
fr. 233 West: see above, under fr. 114;
fr. 234 West *ap.* Ath. 3.70, 107F (cf. Bédier 1969, 104, n. 2 contra Bergk; Bossi 1990, 238): speculative;
fr. 248 West: see above, Archil. 4F2, n. 73;
fr. 255 West: see above, Archil. 4F1, n. 13;
frr. 264, 266: see above, Archil. 4F2, n. 73;
fr. 265 West: see above, under fr. 49;
fr. 266 West: see above, under fr. 264;
fr. 272 West: see above, under fr. 48 Lasserre;
fr. 273 West: see above, Archil. 4F2, n. 73;
fr. 274 West: see above, under fr. 48 Lasserre;
fr. 296 West: see above, under fr. 49;
fr. 301 Adrados (*O.Edfu* 326): see below, under *iamb. adesp.* fr. 55a West
fr. 311 West: see above, Archil. 4F2, n. 73;
frr. 312-313 West: see above, Archil. 4F1, n. 13;
fr. 329 West: see above, Archil. 4F1, n. 13;
"*Epod.* III" (contra Steffen 1952-1953, 33; Rivier, A., "Sur Archiloque et ses épodes", *REG* 65, 1952, 467 (if criticizing Lasserre 1950, 79sqq); Lasserre-Bonnard 1958, 57-59; Adrados 1955, 28-33; id. 1979a, 413; id. 1990, I 42-43; Schwarzbaum 1979, p. XLII n. 41; Bodson 1987, 56, n. 12; Cascajero 1991, 22; cf. Nøjgaard 1964, 451; Irmscher 1987, 5): speculative reconstruction[5];

[5] Lasserre's interpretations and reconstructions of Archilochean fragments have been criticized by (e.g.) Lesky 1971, 143; Nojgaard 1964, 450; West 1971, *Prol.* 16-18: "Quid? Ordinemne praevalere oportebat | Lasserrianum? Pro Camena: in istius |

"*Epod.* IV" (contra Lasserre-Bonnard 1958, 59-61; Adrados 1955, 33-37; id. 1979a, 413; id. 1987a, 156; id. 1990, I 43-44; id. 1993, 3; id., "A Genre of Graeco-Indian Literature: The Erotic Tale", *Annals of the B.O.R. Institute. Amrtamahotsava Suppl.* 74, 1993, 130; Baker 1969, 579-581; Bodson 1987, 56, n. 12; Cascajero 1991, 22): speculative reconstruction (Garbugino 1984, 42; cf. above, n. 5);

"*Epod.* V Lass." (contra Lasserre 1950, 112-121; id.-Bonnard 1958, 61-63; Nøjgaard 1964, 451): speculative reconstruction (cf. above, n. 5);

"*Epod.* VI Lass./V Adr." (contra Lasserre 1950, 122-125; Adrados 1979a, 413): anecdote comparable with *fab. aes.* 170 Hausrath (*Aes.* 161) (cf. Lasserre-Bonnard 1958, 63-64; Adrados 1987a, 179 and 1990, I 44-45);

"*Epod.* XII" (contra Cascajero 1992, 59): ?.

Archippus

Archipp. frr. 35-36 *PCG ap.* Zen. 6.28, Σ *in* Ar. *V.* 191 (contra Van Leeuwen 1909, 38-39): same proverb as Ar. lc (q.v.; Karadagli 1981, 51).

Aristophanes

Ar. *Av.* 15 (contra Σ *ad loc.* (17T15)): reference to Tereus myth (cf. Dunbar 1995, 139-141), not to Aesopic fable;

ib. 39-40 (contra Dunbar's suggestion (1995, 148)): connection with *fab. aes.* 114 Hausrath (Ib, III) (*Aes.* 373) gratuitous;

ib. 49-90 (contra Cascajero 1991, 53; cf. Adrados 1987a, 106): relation to *fab. aes.* 91 Hausrath (*Aes.* 89) at best superficial;

ib. 439-442 (contra Σ (Symm.) *ad loc.* (17T6); Van Leeuwen 1902 *ad loc.*; cf. Dunbar 1995, 304-305): "ape" is not a fable character

---

nolo videri somniasse Parnasso"; Kirkwood 1974, 43-44, 217-218, n. 16; Slings 1983a, 395. Archilochus may well be compared with Aesop (cf. Jul. 4T20; G50); Adrados 1988a; id. "Poesía y sociedad en la literatura griega arcaica y clásica", *SIFC* s. III, 10, 1989(c), 47; Compton 1990), "but he must not be turned into an avatar of Babrius" (West 1974, 137).

but nickname of cutler Panaetius (cf. Ar. *Νῆσοι*, fr. 409 *PCG ap.* Σ (VT) *ad* Ar. *Av.* 440, *Suda*, δ 565 Adler; Salzmann 1910, 80; McDermott 1935, 172; Coulon-Van Daele III 45, n. 1; Lilja 1980, 32; Burelli Bergese, L., "Frinico, fr. 20 Kock", *ASNP s.*III, 11.3, 1981, 607; Van Dijk 1994a, 103);

ib. 489-490 (contra Dunbar's suggestion (1995, 334)): connection with *fab. aes.* 16 and 124 Hausrath (*Aes.* 16 and 122) gratuitous;

ib. 582-625 (contra Cascajero 1991, 53; cf. Adrados 1987a, 106): relation to *fab. aes.* 91 Hausrath (*Aes.* 89) at best superficial;

ib. 734: same proverbial expression as id. *V.* 508 (q.v.);

ib. 1432 (contra Wüst 1921, 40): variant of id. *V.* 959 (q.v.);

ib. 1470-1481 (contra Adrados 1979a, 415; Cascajero 1991, 29; cf. Moulton, C., "The Lyric of Insult and Abuse in Aristophanes", *MH* 36, 1979, 23-47)): present-tense (1478 ἀεὶ!) satire on named contemporary (cf. Dunbar 1995, 688);

ib. 1482-1493 (contra Adrados 1979a, 415): present-tense satire on named contemporary (cf. Dunbar 1995, 688);

ib. 1553-1564 (contra Adrados 1979a, 416; contra Cascajero 1991, 29): satire (in story form (1562 κᾆτ'; cf. e.g. S. 13F2.1152), it is true, but grotesque-fantastic rather than metaphoric) on named contemporaries (cf. Dunbar 1995, 710);

ib. 1673: same proverbial expression (cf. Diogenian. V 2.15) as id. *V.* 508 (q.v.);

ib. 1694-1705 (contra Adrados 1979a, 416; contra Cascajero 1991, 29): present-tense satire on named contemporaries (including a mock-aetiology (1702 Κἀπὸ...ἐκείνων)) (cf. Dunbar 1995, 743);

Δαίδαλος, fr. 199 *PCG*: same proverb as id. *V.* 191 (q.v.);

Ec. 595 (contra Henderson's suggestion (1991, 192); cf. Ussher, R.G., *Aristophanes Ecclesiazusae*, Oxford: Clarendon P 1973, 158): common insult of scatophagy (Vetta, M.-Del Corno, D., *Aristofane. Le Donne all'assamblea*, [Milano]: Mondadori 1989, 203), not deriving from fable;

Eq. 197 (contra Crusius' suggestion (1879, 225, n. 1)): oracular parody of omens (cf. Il. 12.200-207; Ar. *V.* 15-19; Sommerstein, A.H., *Knights*, Warminster: Aris&Phillips 1981, 153), not fable;

ib. 864-867 (contra García Gual 1970, 426, n. 3; cf. Hausrath *ad fab. aes.* 26; Adrados 1987a, 52-53): comparison (present tense!; cf. Komornicka, A.M., *Métaphores, personnifications et comparaisons dans l'œuvre d'Aristophane*, Wrocław/Warszawa/Kraków 1964, 53; Moulton, C., *Aristophanic Poetry*, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck&Ru-

precht 1981, 53), fabulized into *fab. aes.* 1c (*Aes.* 26; cf. Denis 1883, 241 contra Korais; Taylor, A., "It is Good Fishing in Troubled (Muddy) Waters", in: *Selected Writings on Proverbs* (ed. Mieder, W.), Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia 1975 (originally appeared in *Proverbium* 11, 1968), 178);

ib. 887 (contra Neubner 32-34): metaphor (cf. García Gual 1972, 455);

ib. 1038 (contra Crusius 1879, 225, n.1): oracular parody involving common animal metaphors;

ib. 1067 (contra Adrados' suggestion (1987a, 147)): allusion to proverb (see below, S. fr. 885 Radt; cf. Neil, R.A., *The Knights of Aristophanes*, Cambridge 1901 (repr. Hildeheim: Olms 1966), 146), not to *fab. aes.* 139 Hausrath (*Aes.* 136);

ib. 1076-1077 (contra García Gual 1970, 426, n. 3; cf. Kock, Th., *Ausgewählte Komödien des Aristophanes*, II: *Die Ritter*, Berlin: Weidmann 1882[3], 157; Leeuwen, J. van, *Aristophanis Equites*, Leiden: Sijthoff 1900, 186): comparison (ῄκασεν), referring to common animal behaviour (present tense!), not alluding to *fab. aes.* 32 Chambry (15 Hausrath; *Aes.* 15);

Lys. 115 (contra Crusius 1890, 34; Schwarzbaum 1979, p. XL, n. 15): comparison (ὡσπερεὶ) drawn from natural history (cf. Van Leeuwen 1903 *ad loc.*; Keller 1913, 366-367; Thompson 1947, 294-295; Pl. *Smp.* 191d (q.v.));

ib. 158 (contra Wüst's suggestion (1921, 40)): obscene metaphor (cf. Coulon-Van Daele, Henderson 1987, and Sommerstein 1990 *ad loc.*; proverbial according to Σ *ad loc.*, Leutsch-Schneidewin *ad* Diogenian. 5.85 (Apostol. 10.29; *Suda,* κ 2691 Adler: παροιμία); LSJ sv κύων: "'flog a dead horse'");

ib. 629 (contra Rein 1894, 74): allusion to proverb (Diogenian. 6.20; Hsch. λ 1396 Latte (παροιμία); Greg. Cypr. M 4.15; Macar. 5.76; Apostol. 10.85 (Arsen. 34.15); Erasm. *Adag.* 2.3.58 (p. 508B); Mainoldi 1984, 136; cf. Aristaen. *Ep.* 2.20) used in, not deriving from, Babr 16(*Aes.* 158).6;

ib. 781-796 (contra Adrados 1979a, 415; Mainoldi 1984, 201; Dumont 1989, 12; Cascajero 1991, 29 and 1992, 62; cf. Archibald 1912, 66): non-metaphorical *exemplum*[6] (cf. Aly 1921, 257; Adra-

[6] Differently: Bolte 1921, 6: "Märchen" (likewise Von Wilamowitz-Möllendorff 1927 *ad loc.*); Nøjgaard 1964, 459: anecdote; Armstrong 1987: myth (mockingly: legend).

dos 1979a, 257; Rosellini, M., "*Lysistrata*: une mise en scène de la féminité", in: *Aristophane: "Les Femmes et la Cité"*, Fontenay aux Roses 1979, 24);

ib. 805-820 (contra Adrados 1979a, 415; Cascajero 1991, 29): non-metaphorical *exemplum*[7] (cf. Aly 1921, 257; Adrados 1979a, 257; Rosellini lc);

Pax 1076-1077 (contra Borthwick 1968, 135; cf. García Gual 1972, 546, n. 1): typical ἀδύνατον (Canter 1930, 38; LSJ sv λύκος, comparing Il. X 263; proverbial according to Köhler 1881, 159; cf. Erasm. *Adag.* 3.7.36 (p. 892AB)), no connection with a particular fable;

ib. 1079 (contra Schwarzbaum 1979, 274, n. 6; Jedrkiewicz 1989, 364): proverb (Σ *ad loc.*: παροιμία; Perry 1962, 290, n. 5), not an allusion to *fab. aes.* 343 Chambry (251 Hausrath; *Aes.* 223) (differently Borthwick 1968, proposing to read κῳδίνων Ἀκαλανθὶς);

ib. 1083 (cf. Erasm. *Adag.* 3.7.38 (p. 892 CD)) (contra Denis 1883, 232-233, 296; Holbek 1962, 53; Borthwick 1968, 135; Jedrkiewicz 1989, 364; cf. Rutherford 1883, p. XXXII, n. 2; Jacobs 1889, 28-29; cf. García Gual 1972, 546, n. 1; Schwarzbaum 1979, p. L, n. 107): typical ἀδύνατον (Canter 1930, 37; proverbial according to Köhler 1881, 106), not an allusion to *Aes.* 322 (e.g. Babr. 109);

ib. 1086 (contra Borthwick 1968, 135; cf. Rutherford 1883, p. XXXII, n. 2; García Gual 1972, 546, n. 1): typical ἀδύνατον, no connection with a particular fable;

ib. 1112 ~ ib. 1076-1077 (q.v.);

ib. 1114 ~ 1086 (q.v.);

ib. 1189-1190 (contra Rutherford 1883, p. XXXV, n. 3; cf. Wienert 1925, 101, n. 2): proverb (cf. Σ *ad loc.*; Ael. *VH* 13.9; Petr. 44; Eust. *Il.* Ω 262; Leutsch-Schneidewin *ad* Greg. Cypr. M 1.83; Erasm. *Adag.* 4.5.80 (p. 1071BC); Köhler 1881, 57; Otto 1890, 189; Dyson 1929, 187; Taillardat 1965, 168; Platnauer 1964, 164; Adrados 1979a, 219-220);

Pl. 177 (cf. Harp., Phot. sv Φιλέψιος; *Suda*, φ 316 Adler; *App. Prov.* 5.13; Greg. Cypr. L 3.29; Apostol. 17.86 (Arsen. 52.31)) (contra Meuli 1954a, 755 (vainly referring to Kroll, W., "Philepsios",

---

[7] Differently: Von Wilamowitz-Möllendorff 1927 *ad loc.*: "Märchen"; Nøjgaard 1964, 459: anecdote; Armstrong 1987: myth.

RE XIX.2, Stuttgart 1938, col. 2156); Nøjgaard 1964, 465 (misinterpreting Meuli lc); Adrados 1979a, 27): unspecified tales (cf. Σ *ad loc.*: ἱστορίας; Rohde 1914, 591; Bolte 1921, 6: "Märchen"; Holzinger, K., *Kritisch-exegetischer Kommentar zu Aristophanes' Plutos*, *SAWW* 218.3, 1940, 49: "Anekdötchen"; Van Dijk 1993d, 172, n. 3);

Ra. 191 (contra Rutherford 1883, p. XXXV, n. 3; Jacobs 1889, 28; cf. Christoffersson 1901, 123): allusion to proverb (Zen. 4.85: παροιμία; Diogenian. 6.5, 3.8 V; Greg. Cypr. M 4.14; Apostol. 10.41 (Arsen. 33.52); *Suda*, λ 30 Adler; Hsch. λ 71 Latte; Phot. sv λαγωός; Leutsch-Schneidewin *ad* Zen. lc; Van Leeuwen 1896, 42; Stanford 1963a, 89-90; LSJ sv λαγώς), not to fable (Babr. 69 (*Aes.* 331));

ib. 708 (contra Neubner 1889, 32-34): metaphor (cf. McDermott 1935, 172; Stanford 1963a, 133);

ib. 1085 (contra Neubner 1889, 32-34): metaphor (cf. McDermott 1935, 172-173; Stanford 1963a, 167);

Th. 528-529: allusion to same proverb (τὴν παροιμίαν... | τὴν παλαιάν; Erasm. *Adag.* 1.1.34 (p. 164A)) as *Scol.* 903 *PMG* (q.v.; cf. Blaydes, F.H.M., *Aristophanis Thesmophoriazusae*, Halle (Saale) 1880, 188);

ib. 1133 (contra Luria 1934, 456, n. 3 and 1961, 193): combination of common animal metaphors (Leeuwen, J. van, *Aristophanis Thesmophoriazusae*, Leiden: Sijthoff 1904, 143; García Gual 1972, 455), not allusion to Archil. 4F2;

Th. II, fr. 350 *PCG ap. Sudam* λ 816 Adler, Phot. sv λύκος ἔχανεν (contra Rein 1894, 74): variant of proverb alluded to in *Lys.* 629 (q.v.);

V. 82 (contra Cascajero 1992, 60): anecdote (cf. MacDowell, D., "Nikostratos", *CQ* 15, 1965, 48-51; eund. 1971, 140-141);

ib. 165 (contra Adrados 1979a, 413): perhaps unintentionally for "Archil. [fr.] 165 [Adrados = 117 West; q.v.]", in any case not allusion to *fab. aes.* 174 Hausrath (*Aes.* 165);

ib. 191 (contra Schwarzbaum 1979, p. XII; cf. Σ and Tricl. *ad loc.*: proverb (Karadagli 1981, 51), fabulized into D. 40F2 (see above, D. 40F2, nn. 91 and 97);

ib. 375-376 (contra Rutherford, 1883, p. XXXV, n. 3): variant of proverb (Eust. *Il.* X 161: παροιμίαν; Arsen. 50.7 (Apostol. 16.99c); Phot. sv τρέχειν; *Suda*, τ 928 Adler; Leutsch-Schneide-

win *ad* Arsen. lc) alluded to id. *Ra.* 191 (q.v.), not allusion to Babr. 69 (*Aes.* 331);

ib. 508 (*et ap. Sudam*, λ 674 Adler; cf. Diogenian. V 2.15) (contra Wüst 1921, 40): proverbial (Diogenian. 3.92; id. V lc: ἡ παροιμία (likewise Str. 14.1.15; *Συν. λεξ. χρησ. Λουκ.* (2.339 Bachmann); Eust. *Od.* δ 88; id. *in* D.P. 533: παροιμιασθῆναι); Luc. *Merc. Cond.* 13 *c*. Σ *ad loc.*; Greg. Cypr. M 4.71; Apostol. 5.19 (Arsen. 14.39); cf. [Plu.] *Prov.* 38; Petr. 38; Σ *in* Ar. lc; Macar. 6.49; Arsen. 52.20 (Apostol. 17.80b); Rein 1894, 76; Van Leeuwen 1909, 87-88; Salzmann 1910, 80; LSJ sv γάλα 2; Coulon-Van Daele, II 39, n. 2; MacDowell 1971, 202);

ib. 675 (contra Wüst's suggestion (1921, 40)): allusion to proverb (Σ (Callistr.) *ad loc.* (b) παροιμίαν; LSJ sv Κόννος; MacDowell 1971, 224), not to fable;

ib. 891-1008 (contra Giner Soria, C., "El juicio del perro, *Vespae* 891-1008", in: *Actas del V Congreso Español...* 1978, 269-275; Cascajero 1991, 29; cf. Adrados 1987a, 108): *fab. aes.* 94 Hausrath (*Aes.* 92) may be compared but is not *alluded* to (the passage, using common metaphors, is understandable in itself (cf. Lilja 1976, 73-75; Sidwell, K., "Was Philocleon Cured? The ΝΟΣΟΣ Theme in Aristophanes' *Wasps*", *C&M* 41, 1990, 27-28));

ib. 959 (contra Wüst's suggestion (1921, 40)): "semi-proverbial" (Borthwick, E.K., "Two Unnoticed Euripides Fragments?", *CQ* 18, 1968, 199, n. 1);

ib. 989: ~ ib. 959 (q.v.);

ib. 1177-1178 (contra Huschke 1810, p. CCVIII; cf. translation by Van Daele, II 68): allusions to myths (cf. Σ (vet., Tricl.) *ad* 1177a ἐν μύθῳ, ib. (*vet.*) 1178a ἀρχὴ μύθου (but cf. Ar. 17T23b, 17T46b (*vet.*, Tricl.))); Van Leeuwen, 1909, 181; Bolte 1921, 5: "Märchen"; MacDowell 1971, 282-283, comparing *Ec.* 76-78 (but see Leeuwen, J. van., *Aristophanis Ecclesiazusae*, Leiden: Sijthoff 1905, 16) and Crates Com. *Λάμια*, fr. 20 *PCG ap.* Σ *ad Ec.* 77 (cf. Hsch. λ 248 Latte, Phot. sv Λάμια, Σ *in* Paus. 1.1.3); Ar. 17F1), not fables;

ib. 1190-1194: ~ ib. 1381-1386 (q.v.);

ib. 1226, 1238 (contra Jedrkiewicz' suggestion (1989, 349, n. 13), based upon a misunderstanding of West 1984, 120-121);

ib. 1241-1242 (contra Rutherford 1883, p. XXXV, n. 3; Neubner 1889, 32): metaphor (cf. Steiner 1938, 44; García Gual 1970, 425; MacDowell 1971, 293; Villemonteix 1991, 148);

ib. 1290 (contra Neubner 32-34): metaphor (cf. MacDowell 1971, 300);

ib. 1291 (contra Wüst 1921, 39; García Gual 1972, 454): proverb (cf. LSJ s.v. χάραξ);

ib. 1381-1386 (contra Adrados 1979a, 415; Cascajero 1991, 29; cf. Aly 1921, 257): anecdote (cf. Σ (*vet.*, Tricl.) *ad* 1381 διηγηματικῷ; Adrados 1979a, 257; 1987a, 330);

ib. 1409-1411 (contra Wüst 1921, 39; Denis 1883, 241 contra Corai; Adrados 1979a, 415; Cascajero 1991, 29; cf. Jedrkiewicz 1989, 362, n. 50): anecdote about *agon* (cf. Aly 1921, 257, referring to Crusius, O., "Dithyrambos", *RE* 5.1, Stuttgart: Metzler 1903, col. 1213; Christ 1941, 68-69; Bowra 1961, 318; Wehrli, F., "Gnome, Anekdote und Biographie", *MH* 30, 1973, 203; Adrados 1979a, 257; 1987a, 362).

Aristopho

Aristopho, fr. 10 *PCG* (contra Görgemanns' suggestion (1993, 143, n. 81)): conventional description of cicada (cf. Hes. *Op.* 582sqq, *Sc.* 393sqq; Alc. fr. 347 Lobel-Page *ap.* Procl. *in* Hes. *Op.* 584; Ar. *Av.* 1095-1096; Gow 1952, 112; id.-Page 1965, II 1965, 616), rather than allusion to Pl. 49F2.

Aristotle

Arist. *Ath.* 14.2 (contra Karadagli 1981, 87): anecdote, including symbolic action (cf. Aristid. 19.7; Plu. *Mor.* 794F);

Didasc. (fr. 625 Rose): same proverb as Ar. *V.* 191 (q.v.; Karadagli 1981, 51-52);

EN 10.5.8, 1176a7-8: quotes Heraclit. 22B9 Diels-Kranz (q.v.);

HA 6.29, 578b20-23 (contra Adrados 1979a, 302; cf. Mader's unspecified reference (1951, 28): present tense description of animal behaviour, not allusion to Babr. 95 (*Aes.* 336);

ib. 8(9).1, 609b28-30 (contra Cascajero 1991, 46): present tense description of animal behaviour (natural enmity);

ib.6, 612a28-30 (contra Cascajero 1991, 46): present tense description of animal behaviour;

ib.47, 630b32-37 (contra Adrados 1979a, 417 and 1987a, 344; Cas-

cajero 1991, 30): not aetiological fable explaining why, but example illustrating that (cf. Adrados 1987a, 344: "demuestran"), camels do not cover their mothers (cf. Ael. *NA* 3.47; Louis *ad loc.*: "anecdote");

ibid., 631a1-8 (contra Adrados 1987a, 344): to this story the same applies, *mutatis mutandis* (horses, not camels (contra Adrados lc)), as to the preceding one;

Mir. 2, 830b5: same example as *HA* 6.47, 630b32-37 (q.v.);

Po.: see above, Chapter I.I, 2.10 (Pawate);

Pol. 3.13, 1284a26-33: cf. Hdt. 5.92ζη (q.v.);

ib. 5.10, 1311a20-22: cf. Hdt. 5.92ζη (q.v.);

Pr. 18.3, 916b26-36: see above, Arist. G5, n. 21;

Rh. 1.11, 1371b15-16: same proverb (παροιμία[ι]) as Call. *Aet. inc. lib.*, fr. 178.9-10 Pfeiffer; Od. 17.218 (qq.v.);

ib. 2.21, 1395a1-2: quotes Stesich. 17, fr. 281(b) *PMG* (q.v.);

ib. 3.2, 1405b23-28: quotes Simon. fr. 10 *PMG* (q.v.);

ib. 3.11, 1412a23-24: quotes Stesich. (q.v.).

Auctor ad Herennium

Auct. ad Her. 1.8.13 (contra Leibfried-Werle 1978, 128): does not define fable but "die hohe Klasse der *poetica fabula* (Quint. 5,11,17)" (Lausberg, H., *Handbuch der literarischen Rhetorik. Eine Grundlegung der Literaturwissenschaft*, München: Hueber 1960, I 229; cf. Barwick, K., "Die Gliederung der Narratio in der rhetorischen Theorie und ihre Bedeutung für die Geschichte des antiken Romans", *Hermes* 63, 1928, 261-287; Lomanto 1982, 306).

Automedes

Automedes *ap.* Σ *in* Od. γ 267 (I 143 Dindorf), Eust. ibid.: other version of myth in Hermesian. *ap.* Ps.-Plu. *Fluv.* 2.3 (q.v.).

Batrachomyomachia

Batr.: see above, 1. Homer;

ib. 127 (contra Fusillo 1988, 90): general epic parody, not allusion to specific fable (*Aes.* 165)[8].

Bias

Bias 10, 3.6.2 Diels-Kranz *ap.* Stob. 3.1.172.6: same advice as Socr. *ap.* D.L. 2.5 (33) (q.v.).

Bion

contra Simon 1939, 13: "*haud raro...Bion diatribas...fabulis variaba[n]t Aesopeis*": *non inveni* (fr. 13 Gow *ap.* Stob. 4.20.57 is not a fable, but an illustrating example of Eros' elusiveness).

Callimachus

Call. *Aet.* 1(fr. 1 Pfeiffer).10 (contra Puelma, M., "Die Vorbilder der Elegiendichtung in Alexandrien und Rom", *MH* 11, 1954, 105, n. 14; Wimmel 1960, 88, n. 2): connection with *Aes.* 70[9] uncertain, as it depends upon Housman's conjecture δρῦν, which is, admittedly, tempting (contra Wimmel, W. (!), "Philitas im Aitienprolog des Kallimachos", *Hermes* 86, 1958, 350 contra Coppola), as other proposals meet with objections (see Pfeiffer *ad loc.* contra Gallavotti, Milne, Maas, and Vitelli), and in view of "la favola che egli [Filita] aveva bisogno di attaccare ai suoi piedi palle di piombo, per non essere sollevato e portato via dal vento" (Barigazzi, A., "Mimnermo e Filita, Antimaco e Cherilo nel proemio degli Aetia di Callimaco", *Hermes* 84, 1956, 164, referring to Ath. 12.77, 552B);

ib.29-35 (contra Rostagni, A., "Nuovo Callimaco", *RFIC n.s.* 6 (56), 1928, 22; cf. Pfeiffer, R., "Ein neues Altersgedicht des Kallimachos", *Hermes* 63, 1928, 323, n. 6; Steiner 1938, 31; Borthwick,

---

[8] References given above, Ar. 17F1, n. 9.

[9] Babr. 36, Aphth. 36, *fab. aes.* 71, 239 Hausrath, Avian. 16, *fab. dact.* 2 Crusius *ap. Sudam*, π 2460 Adler, *Pa.Bodl.* 101 Chambry, *Tetr.* 1.45, Niceph. Chrys. *Prog.* 2; cf. Lucill. *AP* 10.122.5-6, Macr. 7.8.6; Grawi 1911; Adrados 1987a, 89-90 (incomplete), 231, 527 (medieval versions).

E.K., "A Grasshopper's Diet—Notes on an Epigram of Meleager and a Fragment of Eubulus", *CQ n.s.* 16, 1966, 111-112; Campbell, M., "Three Notes on Alexandrine Poetry", *Hermes* 102, 1974, 46, n. 28; Karadagli 1981, 186; Crane 1986, 272-275; Borgogno, A., "Appunti sulla poetica di Callimaco", *GIF* 39, 1987, 129-135; Davies-Kathirithamby 1986, 124; Jedrkiewicz 1989, 426, n. 11; cf. Wimmel 1960, 112): ingenious combination of two traditional metaphors (cf. Σ Lond. *ad loc.* (p. 7 Pfeiffer) ὄνο(ς) σ(υμ)βαλλ(όμενος) τέττιγ(ι)), which may be *compared* with, but (in spite of some *kenningar* (θηρὶ...ο]ὐατόεντι, quoted by Poll. *AP* 11.130.5; explained by Eust. *Il.* Λ 633-634, ib. Ψ 264), οὐλ[αχ]ύς, ὁ πτερόεις) does not allude to, *fab. aes.* 195 Hausrath (*Aes.* 184)[10]—nor to Pl. 49F2 (cf. Hunter, R., "Winged Callimachus", *ZPE* 79, 1989, 2);

ib. *inc. lib.*, fr. 178.9-10 Pfeiffer (contra *DGE* sv αἶνος I 2): proverb (Stanford 1948, II 287; Trypanis 1958, 95 with n. f; Russo(-Fernández-Galiano-Heubeck) 1992, 28);

Ap. 2.105-113 (contra Wimmel 1960, 61-64, 184): "self-explanatory", if "possibly the most controversial passage in the extant works of Callimachus", not allusion to *Aes.* 100 (*Scol.* 6A1, Arist. 57A2) (Williams, F., *Callimachus. Hymn to Apollo*, Oxford: Clarendon P 1978, 85-97, with further literature);

Epigr. 1 Pfeiffer (54 Gow-Page), *AP* 7.89 *ap.* D.L. 1.79-80, *Suda*, α 4305 (3-6), β 236 (9-10) Adler (contra Karadagli 1981, 85-86; cf. Fraenkel 1920, 367): anecdote (cf. Σ *in* A. *Pr.* 887; Apostol. 16.55 (Arsen. 49.54); Gow-Page 1965, II 205; McKay 1970, 42; Livrea, E., "From Pittacus to Byzantium: The History of a Callimachean Epigram", *CQ* 45, 1995, 474 (although the proverb in lines 12 and 16 is not a "clear reference" (ib. 478) to Ar. 17F3);

Hec., fr. 74.14-20 Hollis (contra Mineur, W.H., "Callimachus van Cyrene, geleerde dichter, dichtende geleerde", *Hermeneus* 63, 1991, 104; cf. Fraser 1972, I 741; Corbato 1979, 47): allusion to metamorphosis of raven in myth (Ov. *Met.* 2.534-541; Apollod.

[10] Cf. Kapp, I., "Callimachea", *Philologus* 84, 1928, 177; Pohlenz, M., "Kallimachos' Antwort an die Kritik", *Nachrichten von der Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen* 1929.2, 150-153; Körte-Händel 1960, 61-62; Diller, H., "Zu Kallimachos", *Hermes* 90, 1962, 119; Kambylis 1965, 82-89; Ferguson 1980, 34; Hutchinson 1988, 80; Bulloch 1989, 36; Massimilla, G., *Callimaco. Aitia. Libri primo e secondo*, Pisa: Giardini 1996, 222.

3.119 (10.3.7); Hyg. 202; Keller 1913, 103 ("Fabel" = "Sage"); Graves 1960, 174; Bulloch 1989, 23; cf. Montes Cala, J.G., *Calimaco. Hécale*, Cádiz 1987, 163sqq; [Hes.] Ἠ οἷαι, fr. 60 Merkelbach-West *ap.* Σ *in* Pi. *P.* 3.52a (Σ: μῦθον); Paus. 2.26.5), not fable;

Iamb. 1 (fr. 191 Pfeiffer).27: see above, Call. 20F1, n. 50;

ibid.32sqq (alluded to by D.L. 1.28-29; paraphrased by *Dieg.* 6.1-21) (contra Diels 1910, col. 994-995; Von Wilamowitz-Möllendorff 1924, I 211; Puelma Piwonka[11] 1949, 209-210, even conjecturing αἶνον (see above, Chapter I.III, 1.1, n. 7); Clayman 1980, 13, 17, 20; Bing 1988, 66; cf. Kuiper 1916, 404-419; Körte 1933, 237; Pfeiffer *ad loc.*; McKay 1970, 42; Hutchinson 1988, 52): anecdote[12] (cf. Plu. *Mor.* 155E; Mikołajczak, J., "De septem sapientium fabulis quaestiones selectae", *Breslauer Philologische Abhandlungen* 9.1, 1902, 59; Wiersma, W., "The Seven Sages and the Prize of Wisdom", *Mnemosyne s. III*ᵃ, 1, 1934, 150-154), if comparable with Call. 20F1-2 (qq.v.) (Gallavotti 1946, 17);

ibid.83 (contra Capovilla 1967, II 59): comparison (ὡς; cf. Pfeiffer *ad loc.*, comparing Pers. 1.60);

ib. 6(fr. 196 Pfeiffer).22 (contra Pfeiffer's suggestion (*ad loc.*)): proverb (cf. Diogenian. 7.57, 3.63 V; Apostol. 5.82, 14.88 (Arsen. 17.99, 48.97); *Suda*, δ 87 Adler)) of the type described by Van Thiel 1971, rather than allusion to *Aes.* 226[13];

ib. 7 (fr. 197 Pfeiffer) (paraphrased by *Dieg.* 7.32-8.20) (contra Clayman 1980, 36; cf. Hutchinson 1988, 52): local aetiological legend (cf. Diehl, E., "Zum Hermes Perpheraios von Ainos", *RhM* 92, 1943, 177; Dawson 1950, 82; Trypanis 1958, 135), not a fable (though set in Αἶνος (for which see above, Chapter I.III, 1.1, nn. 4, 15)!);

ib. 9 (fr. 199 Pfeiffer) (paraphrased by *Dieg.* 8.33-40) (contra Hutchinson's suggestion (1988, 52): dialogue with statue of Hermes, but not a fable for that (in spite of Babr. 30, 48, 119; *fab. aes.* 90, 101 Hausrath (*Aes.* 307-308, 285, 88, 99, respectively));

ib. 12 (fr. 202 Pfeiffer; paraphrased by *Dieg.* 9.25-31) (contra Hutchinson 1988, 51-52, 54): myth (cf. Dawson 1950, 119).

---

[11] Cf. eund. (1972, 100, n. 61), Fraser (1972, I 735): "parable"; Ferguson 1980, 61: "moral story".

[12] Differently Gerhard 1909, 196: "Legende", "Sage".

[13] References given above, Achae. 15A1, nn. 17-18.

Callisthenes

Callisth. *FGrHist*124F13 *ap.* Ath. 10.75, 452AB (contra Karadagli 1981, 93): anecdote, including veiled message (δηλῶν ἐν αἰνιγμῷ; cf. Van Dijk 1994b, 119, n. 1).

Callistratus

Callistr. *in* Ar. *V.* 675: same proverb as that alluded to by Ar. lc (q.v.).

Cicero

Cic. *Inv.* 1.19.27: ~ Auct. ad Her. 1.8.13 (q.v.);
Part. or. 11 (40) (contra Alewell 1913, 15 n. 2, 16 n. 2; Meuli 1954a, 754; Grimm 1970, 40; Adamik 1982, 58; Fisher 1987, 25): uncertain whether *fabula* really refers to fable (*apologus* in Cic. G8-9), rather than to "die hohe Klasse der *poetica fabula*" (Lausberg 1973, 229).[14]

Corinna

Corinn. 654, fr. 1 *PMG*: same myth as in Hermesian. *ap.* Ps.-Plu. *Fluv.* 2.3 (q.v.).

Cratinus

Cratin. *Νόμοι* fr. 135 *PCG ap.* Apostol. 2.17 (Arsen. 3.17; cf. Zen. 1.71, Diogenian. 2.18; Greg. Cypr. M 1.26; *Suda*, α 1391 Adler; Phot. α 1088; *Lex. Segueriana*, 1.218 Bekker) (contra Adrados 1990, 215): metaphor (Jedrkiewicz 1989, 364, n. 56; cf. West *ad* Sol. fr. 11).

[14] Differently Rackham, H., *Cicero. De Oratore*, II, Loeb, 1942 (repr. 1960), 341: "anecdote".

Demetrius Phalereus[15]

Dem. Phal. fr. 120 Wehrli *ap.* D.L. 5.82 (contra Adrados 1987a, 69-70): no evidence for connection with *fab. aes.* 46 Hausrath (*Aes.* 46);

id. *FGrHist*228F32a *ap.* Σ *in* Od. γ 267, Eust. ibid.: refers to myth in Automedes (q.v.).

<*Demetrius*>

Demetr. *Eloc.* 261 (contra Adrados 1987a, 147; 1985, 340; 1987a, 147): comparison (ἔοικε), not allusion to *fab. aes.* 139 Hausrath (*Aes.* 136).

Democritus

Democr. 68A33 Diels-Kranz: see above, Chapter I.III, 5.7, n. 148;

ib. B149 *ap.* Plu. *Mor.* 500D (contra Stewart's suggestion (1958, 190, n. 26; cf. Spinelli 1991, 306, n. 74)): general statement, not necessarily commenting upon fable (*Aes.* 12) told by Plutarch[16] before referring to Democritus;

ib. B299 *ap.* Clem. Al. *Strom.* 1.15.69 (cf. Eus. *PE* 10.4.23) (contra Priest's suggestion (1985, 54)): unclear (if not impossible) whether his (or his impersonator's; Nöldeke 1913, 21; Diels-Kranz) translation of *Ahiqar* contained any fables (Perry 1965, p. LX; Jedrkiewicz 1989, 72, n. 10; Wilsdorf 1991).

[Demodocus]

[Demod.] fr. 5 West (*AP* 11.237) *ap.* Const. Porph. *Them.* 21 (contra Adrados 1991b, 741-742): jocular anecdote.

---

[15] *Demetrius Phalereus* is a fable *character* in Phaedr. 5.1 (*Aes.* 523), if "confused and conflated with his successor in the regency of Athens, the Macedonian Demetrius Poliorcetes" (Perry 1965, 351, n. a).

[16] *Mor.* 500CD; Avian. 40, *fab aes.* 12 Hausrath, *Tetr.* 2.16, *Pa.Bodl.* 37 Chambry, Eust. *Opusc. Ep.* 51 (p. 353 Tafel), Dati 14; Adrados 1987a, 41-42 (incomplete), 516 (medieval versions).

Demosthenes

D. 18.243 (contra Wienert 1925, 84, n. 1): hypothetical comparison (ὥσπερ...εἰ *c. opt.* (*pot.*)), *comparable* to *fab. aes.* 116 Hausrath, *Dod.* 135 Chambry (*Aes.* 114) (cf. Chambry 1960, p. XXX, n. 1; Jedrkiewicz 1989, 401).

Diagoras

Diagor. *ap.* Tat., *Sudam*, δ 523 Adler: see above, Chapter I.III, 5.7, n. 148.

Didymus

Did. fr. 2 Diels-Schubart *ap.* Harp. *s.v.* Περὶ...: same proverb as Ar. *V.* 191 (q.v.);
in Il. 22.126 (p. 182 Schmidt): explains Il. lc (q.v.).

Diodorus Siculus

D.S. 9.20.2: quotes Sol. fr. 11 West (q.v.; see also (contra Karadagli 1981, 87) Arist. *Ath.* 14.2 (Van Dijk 1994b, 119, n. 1));
ib. 35.2 (contra Meuli 1954b, 728, n. 3): account of personal experience (1 τῶν πρότερον ἑαυτῷ συμβάντων), which may be *compared* with Hdt. 31F1 and D.S. 38F1-2 (Van Dijk 1994b, 124-125, n. 58).

Diogenes[17]

Diog. *Πόρδαλος ap.* D.L. 6.2 (80) (contra suggestions by Crusius (*ad* Babr. 180), Hirzel 1895, I, 338-339), Gerhard (1909, 247) and Adrados (1987a, 41)): connection with *fab. aes.* 12 Hausrath (*Aes.* 12) purely speculative, going by the title only;
Κολοιός ap. D.L. 6.2 (80) (contra Crusius *ad* Babr. 72; Hirzel lc;

[17] Diogenes is a fable *character* in *fab. aes.* 65-65a Hausrath (*Aes.* 247-248).

Hausrath *ad fab. aes.* 103; Adrados 1979a, 189; 1987a, 115; cf. eund. 1985, 340; Gerhard 1909, 247): connection with *Aes.* 101[18] purely speculative, going by the title only (Van Dijk 1994b, 132, n. 151).

[Diogenes]

Diog. *Ep.* 30: allegory derived from Hes. *Op.* 287-292 (q.v.; cf. also above, Cerc. 22A1).

Dioscorides

Diosc. 16 Gow-Page, *AP* 6.220 (*et ap. Sudam*, ε 4078, svv θ 198 (3-4), ο 374 (7-8), τ 1167 (9-10), μ 1394 (11-12), θ 6, λ 74 (15-16) Adler): same theme (16 ἀντίθεμαι; *lemm. ad loc.* εἰς τὸ αὐτό) as [Simon.] 59 Page (2 Gow-Page), *AP* 6.217 (q.v.; cf. White, H., "The Lion and the Gallus", in: *Essays in Hellenistic Poetry*, Amsterdam/Uithoorn: Gieben 1980, 69-78).

Epicharmus

Epich. (contra Giangrande's unspecified statement (1972, 21), perhaps misinterpreting Ibyc. 8T1 (Ael.; see above, Dinol. 16F1).

Eratosthenes

Eratosth. *Πρὸς Βάτωνα* (p. 202 Bernhardy) *ap.* D.L. 8.8 (89): refers to Eudox. *Κυνῶν διάλογοι* (fr. 374 Lasserre; q.v.).

Eubulus

Eub. fr. 14.11 *PCG ap.* Ath. 14.17, 622F: same proverb as that alluded to in Ar. *Lys.* 629 (q.v.);

---

[18] References given above, Phld. 42A1a, nn. 126, 128.

id., *Σεμέλη ἢ Διόνυσος* (?), fr. 93 *PCG ap.* Ath. 2.3, 36BC (*Suda*, οι 135 Adler) (contra Adrados 1987a, 319): variant of myth in Panyas. fr. 13 Davies (q.v.; cf. Hunter, R.L., *Eubulus. The Fragments*, Cambridge...: UP 1983, 187-188).

Eudoxus of Cnidus

Eudox. *Κυνῶν*[19] *διάλογοι*, fr. 374 Lasserre *ap.* Eratosth. *Πρὸς Βάτωνα* (p. 202 Bernhardy) *ap.* D.L. 8.8 (89) (contra Koep 1969, col. 144; cf. Hirzel 1895, I 339; Von Bissing 1949; Lasserre *ad loc.* (F., *Die Fragmente von Eudoxos von Knidos*, Berlin: De Gruyter 1966, 268-269); Mau, J., "Eudoxos" (1), *DKP* 2, col. 409): it cannot be ascertained whether the title of this work (its only remnant) really refers to fable characters in Egyptian Sun myth[20] (cf. Holbek 1962, 47-48; Jedrkiewicz 1989, 416, n. 49), rather than to "canine deities, such as Anubis, Wepwawet, and Set" (notably within "the religious orbit of Cynopolis"; Griffiths, J.G., "A Translation from the Egyptian [cf. D.L. lc] by Eudoxus", *CQ* 59, 1965, 75-78, adducing *PJumilhac*, and comparing Plu. *Mor.* 368 EF; D.S. 1.87.2; Verg. *A.* 8.698).

Euenus

Euenus Par. *ap.* Pl. *Phd.* 60d (contra Hartung *ap.* Neubner 1889, 36-37): speculative.

Euphro

Euphro, *Ἀδελφοί*, fr. 1.30-31 *PCG ap.* Ath. 9.24, 380B: allusion to same proverb as that alluded to in Ar. *Lys.* 629 (q.v.).

---

[19] Not to be emended into *νεκύων*, *Κυνικῶν*, *Γυμνῶν*, or *κυνοκεφάλων* (Griffiths contra Semler, Künssberg, Hultsch and Rehm, respectively).

[20] Cf. *PBrit.Mus.* 274, *PLeid.* 1.384; Spiegelberg, W., "Der ägyptische Mythus vom Sonnenauge in einem demotischen Papyrus der römischen Kaiserzeit", *Sitzungsberichte der Königlich Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, phil.-hist. Kl.* 1915, 876-894; id., "Eine Illustration der Ramessidenzeit zu dem ägyptischen Mythus von Sonnenauge", *Orientalische Literaturzeitung* 19, 1916, 225-228; id.-Reitzenstein, R.-Crönert, W., "Die griechische Tefnutlegende", *SHAW* 1923.2; Brunner-Traut 1974, 34-39; Van Rooijen-Dijkman 1984, 14.

Eupolis

Eupolis, fr. 411 *PCG ap.* Diogenian. V 2.15: same proverbial expression (Rein 1894, 76) as Ar. *V.* 508 (q.v.).

Euripides

E. *Alc.* 669-672 (contra Grauert 1825, 102; Keller 1861-1867, 383, n. 98; Pawate 1986, 41; Cascajero 1991, 52; cf. Dale, A.M., *Euripides. Alcestis*, Oxford: Clarendon P 1954 *ad loc.*): maxim, fabulized into *Aes.* 60 (*fab. aes.* 60 Hausrath, Synt. 2, *Syr.* IV Lefèvre, *Tetr.* 2.21) (cf. Dressel 1876, 27; Denis 1883, 238; Neubner 1889, 29; Adrados 1979a, 64, 418 and 1987a, 80);

Ba. 795: same proverb (Zen. 5.70) as Pi. *P.* 2.94-95 (q.v.);

Πελιάδες, fr. 604 Nauck² *ap.* Stob. *Flor.* 3.22: same proverb as Pi. *P.* 2.94-95 (q.v.);

Supp. 444-449: cf. Hdt. 5.92ζη (q.v.);

ib. 1222-1223 (contra Collard 1975 *ad loc.*): metaphor (cf. Dyson 1929, 187; Groeneboom 1944, 238).

Fabulae Aesopicae

Praef. fab. Aes.: see above, under [Aphth.].

Hecataeus

Hecat. (contra Rutherford's suggestion (1883, p. XXXIII, n. 1)): substitution of Ἑκαταίῳ for ἑκατέρῳ in Philist. 33T1 (Theon) superseded by Jacoby's convincing emendation (*ad loc.*) of the text.

Heraclitus

Heraclit. 22B9 Diels-Kranz (contra Weinreich's suggestion (O., "Zur Wahl der Lebensgüter", *WS* 48, 1930, 199-200)): suggestion that this general statement derives from a particular (lost) fable comparable with *Aes.* 179 (*fab. aes.* 190 Hausrath; *Dod.* 274 Chambry; *fab. dact.* 15 Crusius) is purely speculative;

22A3B *ap.* Them. *Virt.*, p. 59 Schenkl-Downey-Norman (Mach) (cf. Plu. *Mor.* 511C) (contra Karadagli 1981, 88-89): anecdote, including symbolic action.

Hermesianax

Hermesian. *ap.* Ps.-Plu. *Fluv.* 2.3 (contra Adrados 1985, 354; 1993, 12; Cascajero 1992, 53; cf. Page, D.L., *Corinna*, London: The Society for the Promotion of Hellenic Studies 1963, 21-22): myth (Perry 1962, 303; Adrados, F.R., "Mas fragmentos nuevos de poesia grieca antigua [*sic*]", in: *Studi in onore di Adelmo Barigazzi*, I, Roma 1986, 6 (=*Sileno* 1984/1985); id. 1987a, 295), referred to (fabulized) by Him. G56 (*Aes.* 432).

Hermippus

Hermipp. Hist., *FHG* III 39 F 10 (fr. 10 Wehrli *ap.* Plu. *Sol.* 6.7): refers to Pataecus (q.v.).

Herodas

Herod. 6.102 (contra Weyman, *art. cit.* (below, n. 21), 66): reference to hens (Arbuthnot Nairn, J., *The Mimes of Herodas*, Oxford: Clarendon P 1904, 80; Groeneboom, P., *Les Mimiambes d'Hérodas I-VI*, Groningen 1922 (repr. Roma: 'L'Erma' di Bretschneider 1973), 195; Headlam, W.-Knox, A.D., *Herodas. The Mimes and Fragments*, Cambridge: UP 1922, 315; Cunningham, I.C., *Herodas. Mimiambi*, Oxford: Clarendon P 1971, 174; cf. Hutchinson 1988, 252), not to snake of *Aes.* 176 (e.g. *fab. aes.* 62, 186 Hausrath).

Herodotus

Hdt. 1.125 (contra Karadagli 1981, 77; Nagy 1988, 239, n. 33): (pseudo-historical) anecdote, including symbolic action (cf. Van Dijk 1994b, 119, n. 1);

1.158-159 (contra Aly 1921, 55; Karadagli 1981, 78-79; Nagy 1988, 239, n. 33): anecdote, including symbolic action (cf. Van Dijk 1994b, 119, n. 1);

2.141 (contra Koep 1969, col. 141; Wagner, F., "Äsopika", *Enzyklopädie des Märchens* 1, Berlin/New York: De Gruyter 1977, col. 889): description of miraculous event (cf. How-Wells 1928, I 236), possibly going back to a Greek (Wiedemann, A., *Herodots zweites Buch mit sachlichen Erläuterungen*, Leipzig: Teubner 1890 (repr. Milano: Cisalpino-Goliardica 1971), 503-505) or Eastern (Dawson 1925, 235-236) legend (Van Dijk 1994b, 119, n. 2);

2.173 (contra Perry 1965, p. XCV, n. 3): anecdote—if fabulized by Phaedr. (3.14 (*Aes.* 505); cf. Otto 1890, 36, adducing some related proverbs[21])—, including symbolic action;

3.32 (contra Aly's speculations (1921, 77-78, 154, 238)): allegedly true story (cf. Jedrkiewicz 1983, 261; Van Dijk 1994b, 119, n. 2);

3.46 (contra Karadagli 1981, 84-85; Nagy 1988, 239, n. 33): anecdote, including symbolic action (cf. S.E. *M.* 2.23; How-Wells 1928, II 268-269) (cf. Van Dijk 1994b, 119, n. 1);

3.142-143 (contra Nagy 1988, 239, n. 33): (pseudo-)historical story, at best *comparable* with *Aes.* 348 (*Pa.Bodl.* 229 Chambry) (Van Dijk 1994b, 120, n. 2);

4.131-132 (cf. Ath. 8.9, 334A) (contra Karadagli 1981, 91-92; Nagy 1988, 239, n. 33; cf. Fusillo 1988, 32): anecdote, including symbolic action (cf. How-Wells 1928, I 342; Vaio 1981, 398; Van Dijk 1994b, 119, n. 1);

5.92ζη (contra Karadagli 1981, 75-76; Nagy 1988, 239, n. 33): anecdote, including symbolic action (cf. Parmentier, L.-Grégoire, H., *Euripide*, III, Budé, 1959, 119, n. 5; Vaio 1981, 398; Van Dijk 1994b, 119, n. 1);

6.86 (contra Nagy 1988, 239, n. 33; cf. Meuli 1954a, 755; Karadagli 1981, 35-37): a (pseudo-)historical *exemplum* (possibly (see Adrados 1979a, 64; 1987a, 213)) fabulized into *fab. aes.* 214 Hausrath (*Aes.* 239)), which allegedly really happened (86.1 συνηνείχθη γενέσθαι) and is non-metaphorical, as both context and story

[21] *Addenda* by Szelinski, V., *Nachträge und Ergänzungen zu Otto, Die Sprichwörter und sprichwörtlichen Redensarten der Römer*, Diss. Jena 1892, 24; Weyman, C., "Zu den Sprichwörtern und sprichwörtlichen Redensarten der Römer", *Archiv für lateinische Lexikographie* 8, 1893, 53 and ib. 13, 1904, 264; Sutphen, M.C., "A Further Collection of Latin Proverbs", *AJPh* 22, 1901, 12 (repr. in Häussler, R., *Nachträge zu A. Otto...*, Hildesheim: Olms 1968, 36, 51, 261, 135, respectively).

deal with a refusal to give back a παραθήκη (86.1 *bis*) (Van Dijk 1994b, 119-120, n. 2;
7.10ε (contra Schadewaldt 1982, 46): present tense comparison (ὁρᾷς...ὡς *bis* [cf. S. *Ant.* 710-714], οὕτω δὲ καὶ);
7.57.1: same proverb as Ar. *Ra.* 191 (q.v.);
7.152 (contra Nagy 1988, 229-230; cf. Macan, R.W., *Herodotus. The Seventh, Eighth, & Ninth Books*, I.1-2, 1908 (repr. New York: Arno P 1973), 209): γνώμη (How-Wells 1928, II 191), at most *comparable* with, not alluding to, *Aes.* 266[22];
9.37.2: same proverb as Ar. *V.* 375-376 (q.v.).

Hesiod

Hes. *Op.* 10-26 (contra Fuss, W., *Versuch einer Analyse von Hesiods Ἔργα καὶ Ἡμέραι*, Diss. Borna-Leipzig: Noske 1910, 28, 31-32; Cascajero 1992, 53; cf. Adrados 1987a, 326-327): present tense doctrine featuring personification and genealogy (cf. e.g. West 1978a, 142-143);
ib. 42-89 (contra Adrados 1979a, 412): myth (e.g. West 1978a, 155);
ib. 90-105 (contra Adrados 1979a, 412; Cascajero 1992, 62): myth (Lendle, O., *Die 'Pandorasage' bei Hesiod*, Würzburg: Triltsch 1957, 108, n. 49; Neitzel 1976, 387-419; Adrados 1987a, 392; cf. Raddatz 1909), fabulized into Babr. 58 (*Pa.Bodl.* 124 Chambry; *Aes.* 312) (Friedländer, P., "Prometheus-Pandora und die Weltalter bei Hesiod", in: id., *Studien zur antiken Literatur und Kunst*, Berlin 1969, 65-67 (first appeared in: *Zeitschrift für das Gymnasialwesen* 66, 1912, 802-803); Séchan, L., "Pandora, l'Ève grecque", *BAGB* 22, avril 1929, 36; Nøjgaard 1967, 327; Duchemin 1975/1976, 34; Neitzel 1976, 389, n. 9; West 1978a, 170; Rudhardt, J., "Pandora: Hésiode et les femmes", *MH* 43, 1986, 235; Adrados 1987a, 334; Beall, E.F., "The Contents of Hesiod's Pandora Jar: Erga 94-98", *Hermes* 117, 1989, 228; cf. Harrison, J.E., "Pandora's Box", *JHS* 20, 1900, 99; Radermacher, L., *Mythos und Sage bei den Griechen*, Brünn/München/Wien

[22] Hor. *S.* 2.3.298-299 (*c.* Porph. Ps.-Acr. *ad loc.*); Cat. 22.21; Phaedr. 4.10; Sen. *De ira* 2.28.8; Pers. 4.24; Plu. *Crass.* 32; Gal. *Aff. Dign.* 2.7, *Hipp. prorrh.* 1.2.13, *Pecc. Dign.* 2.8 (5.6, 16.614, 5.64 Kühn); Babr. 66; Them. *Or.* 21, 262b; *fab. aes.* 229 Hausrath; Aesop. *Sent.* 23 Perry *ap.* Stob. 3.23.6; *Pa.Bodl.* 304 Chambry; Tz. *Chil.* 9.943-948; Erasm. *Mor. enc.* 19 (Adrados 1987a, 223 (incomplete)).

1943[2] (repr. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft 1968), 32);

ib. 106-201 (contra Adrados 1987a, 294; Cascajero 1992, 63; cf. Raddatz 1909, 31): myth (e.g. Vernant, J.-P., "Le mythe hésiodique des races", *RPh s. III*[e], 40, 1966, 247-276; Broccia, G., "Esiodo, *Erga* 106-108", *Euphrosyne n.s.* 3, 1969, 167; West 1978a, 172-177 (with select bibliography); Querbach, C.W., "Hesiod's Myth of the *Four* Races", *CJ* 81, 1985, 1-12);

ib. 287-292 (*et ap.* Stob. 3.1.205; referred to by Plu. *Mor.* 77D) (contra Adrados 1979a, 412; 1987a, 322; cf. Cascajero 1991, 21): metaphor (West 1978a, 230), fabulized into *Vit. Aesop.* 94 (see below, under X. *Mem.* 2.1.21-34));

Th. 35: proverbial phrase (Σ *ad loc.*: παροιμία (p. 10 Di Gregorio); cf. Verdenius, W.J., "Hesiod *Theogony* 35", *Mnemosyne s. IV*[a], 11, 1958, 20-24) comparable with Il. 22.126 (q.v.);

ib. 535-569 (contra Adrados 1979a, 412; cf. Karadagli 1981, 140-142): see above, *Op.* 42-89 (e.g. West 1966, 305-308);

ib. 570-616 (contra Adrados 1979a, 412): see above, *Op.* 90-105.

Hippocrates

Hipp. 1.390, 392 Kühn: quotes Od. 17.218 (q.v.).

Hipponax

Hippon. fr. 118.3 West (contra Neubner's suggestion (1889, 18); cf. Adrados 1979a, 256 (in general)): comparison (ὡς), which might be *compared* with Semon. 5F1.

Homer

Il. 22.126 (contra Mainoldi 1984, 209, n. 1; cf. Leaf, W.-Bayfield, M.A., *The Iliad of Homer*, II, London: Macmillan; New York: St Martin's P 1898 (repr. 1956), 526-527): (obscure) proverbial phrase (Macar. 3.40; West 1966, 167-169; Richardson, N. (Kirk 1993, VI), 119-120; cf. Σ *ad loc.*; Ameis, K.F.-Hentze, C., *Homers Ilias für den Schulgebrauch erklärt*, 2.4, Leipzig: Teubner 1922[4], 12);

ibid.161: same proverb as Ar. *V.* 375-376 (q.v.);
Od. 4.335-340 (contra Lecomte, M., *Animali parlanti. Le parole degli animali nella letteratura del Cinquecento e del Seicento*, Firenze: Atheneum 1995, 70, 92 n. 3): present tense simile (ὡς δ' ὁπότ'...ὡς; (Heubeck, A.-)West, S.(-Hainsworth, J.B.), *A Commentary on Homer's Odyssey*, I, Oxford: UP 1988, 213;
ib. 8.329 (contra Aafjes, B., *Homeros. Odyssee*, Amsterdam: Meulenhoff 1965 (repr. 1966), 66): connection with *Aes.* 226[23] in translation absent from original;
ib. 14.462-506: see above, 1. Homer;
ib. 17.126-131: repetition of ib. 4.335-340 (q.v.);
ibid.218: same proverb as Call. *Aet. inc. lib.*, fr. 178.9-10 Pfeiffer (q.v.);
ib. 19.163 (cf. Lucill. *AP* 11. 253.3, Pall. *AP* 10.55.2-3) (contra Mainoldi 1984, 209, n. 1; Dros, I., *Homeros Odysseia*, Amsterdam: Querido 1991, 313[24]): proverbial phrase (comparable, but not identical, with Il. 22.126), possibly deriving from myth (Σ *ad loc.*, Eust. ibid.: παροιμιώδης ὁ λόγος; Ameis, K.F.-Hentze, C.-Cauer, P., *Homers Odyssee für den Schulgebrauch erklärt*, 2.2, Leipzig/Berlin: Teubner 192810, 12; cf. Stanford 1948, II 321; Russo (-Fernández-Galiano-Heubeck) 1992, 83; West 1966, 167).

[Homer]

Marg. fr. 5 West: see above, 1. Homer.

iambica adespota

iamb. adesp. 12 Diehl: see [Sol.];
ib. 13: see [Sol.];
ib. 33 (*ap.* Hsch. sv πορδηκίδαι) (contra Lasserre 1948, 11, n. 11; id. 1950, 120-121; id.-Bonnard 1958, 31; Adrados 1979a, 413; id. 1990, I 101, n. 1; Cascajero 1991, 22, n. 25): connection with Babr. 62 (*Aes.* 315) remains speculative, as Hsch. does not refer explicitly to fable;

[23] References given above, Achae. 15A1, nn. 17-18.
[24] I owe this reference to my colleague Ad van der Zanden.

fr. 55a West (contra eund. 1978b, 1-5): basis for a connection with Hes. 2F1 too weak (Adrados 1990, II 309, n. 15).

Ion

Ion, *TragGrF* I 19F36.4-5 *ap.* Plu. *Mor.* 971EF (contra Jacobs 1889, 28): = Archil. fr. 201 West (q.v.).

Isidorus

Isid. *Etym.* 1.44.5: ~ Auct. ad Her. 1.8.13 (q.v.).

Leandrius[25]

Leandr. *FGrHist*492T18 *ap.* D.L. 1.28-29: paraphrase of Call. *Iamb.* 1, fr. 191 Pfeiffer (q.v.; cf. Ferguson 1980, 60).

Lysimachus Cyren.

Lysim. Cyren. *ap.* Tz. *in* Hes. (pp. 29-30 Gaisford), *H.* 6.913-916 (88): other version of myth in Hermesian. *ap.* Ps.-Plu. *Fluv.* 2.3 (q.v.).

Martianus Capella

Mart. Cap. 5.46 (550): ~ Auct. ad Her. 1.8.13 (q.v.).

Meleager

Mel. 13 Gow-Page, *AP* 7.196 (*et ap. Sudam* svv α 368 (1-2), κ 2231 (3-4) Adler) (contra La Penna, A., "Marginalia et hariolationes philologae", *Maia* 5, 1952, 110-111; cf. Görgemanns 1993, 143,

[25] "Maiandrios" according to Von Wilamowitz-Möllendorff 1924, I 211 (see Pfeiffer *ad* Call. fr. 191.32).

n. 81): conventional description of cicada, comparable with, but not alluding to, Pl. 49F2 (rather to the preceding epigram; cf. Gow-Page 1965, II 615-617).

Menander[26]

Men. *Asp.* 372-373: same proverb as that alluded to in Ar. *Lys.* 629 (q.v.);

id. *Dysc.* 224-226 (contra Tzifopoulos 1995[27], 173-174): to be connected with mythology, like (but not: like with) *fab. aes.* 188 Hausrath (*Aes.* 178);

ib. 505-507 (contra Tzifopoulos 1995, 175): comparable with Archil. fr. 173 West, which probably belongs to the *context* of Archil. 4F1 (q.v.), not to the fable itself;

ib. 568-570 (contra Tzifopoulos 1995, 175): see previous entry;

ib. 633-634 (contra Martin, V., *Papyrus Bodmer IV. Ménandre: Le Dyscolos*, Cologny-Genève: Bibliotheca Bodmeriana 1958, 70 (addendum); Nøjgaard 1964, 126, 466; Lilja 1976, 86, n. 59 contra Treu; Adrados 1979a, 30, 416 and 1987a, 131; Arnott, W.G., *Menander*, I, Loeb, 1979, 288, n. 1; Bissinger, M., *Menander. Dyskolos*, Bamberg: Buchner 1983 (= 1979) *ad loc.*; Cascajero 1991, 29, n. 38; cf. Kraus, W., "Menanders Dyskolos...", *SAWW* 234.4, 1960, 102; Perry 1965, 445; Stoessl, F., *Menander. Dyskolos*, Paderborn: Schöningh 1965, 159; Gomme, A.-Sandbach, F., *Menander. A Commentary*, Oxford: UP 1973, 232; Tzifopoulos 1995, 172): proverb (τὸ τοῦ λόγου; cf. Zen. 3.45; Hsch. ε 3449 Latte παροιμία; *Suda*, ε 1505 Adler (ὑπὸ τοῦ παροιμιαζομένου κυνός); Greg. Cypr. 2.43, M 3.16; Apostol. 7.40 (Arsen. 23.82); cf. Pl. *Tht.* 165C τὸ λεγόμενον ἐν φρέατι συσχόμενος; Krzyżanowski, J., "The Polish Proverb 'The Dog in the Well'", in: Hand-Arlt 1960, 353; Handley, E.W., *The Dyskolos of Menander*, London: Methuen&Co. 1965, 242; Van Dijk 1993d, 172, n. 3), which is *comparable* with *fab. aes.* 122 Hausrath (*Aes.* 120);

fr. 6 Arnott: same proverb as Ar. *V.* 191 (q.v.);

fr. 713 Kock (*dist. Par.*) = E. *Alc.* 669-670 (q.v.; πολὺν *pro* μακρὸν);

---

[26] Menander is a fable *character* in Phaedr. 5.1 (9 *nobilis comoediis*, 17 *scriptor*; *Aes.* 523).

[27] I am grateful to Prof. Bremer for kindly drawing my attention to this article.

fr. 892 Koerte *ap.* Str. 14.1.15: same proverbial expression (τὴν λέγουσαν παροιμίαν Str.; Rein 1894, 76) as Ar. *V.* 508 (q.v.);
fr. 697 *ap.* Eust. *in* Il. K 334 (contra Leutsch-Schneidewin *ad* Macar. 5.70): general animal metaphor, not allusion to specific Aesopic fable (e.g. 257 De Furia (166 Hausrath; *Aes.* 160)).

Menecrates

Menecr. 2 Gow-Page, *AP* 9.54 (*et ap.* Stob. 4.50.62) (contra Waltz-Soury 1957, VII 22, n. 1): gnome (present tense!), *comparable* with *fab. aes.* 60 Hausrath (*Aes.* 60).

Minucianus

Minuc. *Περὶ ἐπιχειρημάτων*, I 343 (Spengel-)Hammer (contra Alewell 1913, 21-22, comparing πλάσμα in Greg. Cor., 7.1150 Walz): unclear whether μῦθοι is really synonymous with "fables".

Mnesimachus

Mnesim. *Φίλιππος*, fr. 9 *PCG ap.* Ath. 9.37, 387B: same proverbial expression (τὸ λεγόμενον) as Ar. *V.* 508 (q.v.).

Nicolaus Damascenus

Nicol. Dam. *FGrHist*90F56 (contra Hausrath 1938, col. 1487; Chambry 1960, p. XXXI; cf. Janssens 1955, 19; Warmuth 1992, 65sqq): anecdote, fabulized into *fab. aes.* 94 Hausrath (*Aes.* 92) (Van Dijk 1994b, 126, n. 82).

Panyasis

Panyas. *Heracleia*, fr. 13 Davies *ap.* Ath. 2.3, 36D (contra Adrados 1979a, 415; 1985, 455; 1993, 11; Roth, P., "Zu Panyassis F 12-

14", *RhM* 134, 1991, 249-250; Cascajero 1992, 61): "mythological prototype" (Perry 1962, 296; cf. Apu. *Flor.* 20, Fulg. *Myth.* 12, *Anecd. Gr.* IV 254 Cramer, Georg. (*Anecd. Gr.* 1.41), [Max. Conf.] *Loc. Comm.* (*PG* 91, col. 885), Ant. *Mel.* 1.41; cf. Matthews, V.J., *Panyassis of Halikarnassos*, Leiden: Brill 1974, 81) of *Vit. Aesop.* 68GW, Phot. *Ep.* 277 (not in *Aes.*, but see Bielohlawek, K., "Gastmahls- und Symposionslehre bei griechischen Dichtern (von Homer bis zur Theognissammlung und Kritias)", *WS* 58, 1940, 23; Grumel 1951; Perry 1953; Jedrkiewicz 1989, 348-349; Van Dijk 1994a, 96; 1995b, 137).

Pataecus

Pataecus *ap.* Hermipp. Hist., *FHG* III 39 F 10 (fr. 10 Wehrli *ap.* Plu. *Sol.* 6.7; *Aes.* T46) (contra Manfredini, M.-Piccirilli, L., *Plutarco. La vita di Solone*, *s.l.*: *Mondadori* 1977, 129): pure speculation.

Pherecrates

Pherecr. *Μυρμηκάνθρωποι*, fr. 117 *PCG ap. Et. Gen.* β 308 Berger (*EM* p. 218,24; *Et. Sym.* β 270 Berger; cf. Phot. β 182), Ath. 7.27, 287A (contra Josifović: 1974, col. 39, misinterpreting Klinger 1961, 227, who by "fabula" means "play", not "fable"; cf. Adrados 1979a, 63, 416; 1987a, 289-290): speculative, as a "grunting fish" (LSJ sv βόαξ; see Thompson 1947, 36) is not necessarily a fable character;

fr. 193 *PCG ap.* Ar. *Lys.* 158 (q.v.); Σ *ad loc.*; *Suda*, κ 2691 Adler.

Pherecydes

Pherecyd. *FGrHist*3F174 *ap.* Clem. Al. *Strom.* 5.8.44 (contra Karadagli 1981, 92, n. 1): slightly different version (cf. How-Wells 1928, I 342-343) of anecdote told by Hdt. 4.131-132 (q.v.).

Philepsius

Phileps. *ap.* Ar. *Pl.* 177 (q.v.).

Philistus

Philist. *FGrHist556F6* (*bis*) *ap.* Theon. G20b: see above, Philist. 33F1, n. 43.

Philodemus

Phld. 14 Gow-Page, *AP* 9.570 (contra Karadagli 1981, 61-62): melancholy epigram (3 ψῆλόν μοι, 5 ᾆδε πάλιν μοι), not a fictitious story (as fables typically are), not to mention the questionable authenticity of the final distich (athetized by Kaibel (G., *Hermes* 15, 1880, 460; *Philodemi Gadarensis epigrammata*, Greifswald 1885, pp. XIVsq), Paton (1916-1918, III 316, n. 1) and Gow-Page (1968, II 384); revindicated by Luck (G., "Witz und Sentiment im griechischen Epigramm", in: *L'épigramme grecque*, Genève: Fondation Hardt 1968, 407) and Merkelbach 1972).

Phocylides

Phoc. fr. 2 West: ~ Semon. fr. 7 West (q.v.; cf. West, M.L., "Phocylides", *JHS* 98, 1978, 166-167).

Phoenix

Phoen. (contra Adrados 1992, 143; cf. 1979a, 256): no fables to be found (in spite of Gerhard 1909, 49, 229, 246);

fr. 1 Powell (2 Gerhard 1909) *ap.* Ath. 12.40, 530E-531A (contra Hutchinson's suggestion (1988, 52)): typical story about an immensely wealthy, but unhappy, Eastern monarch (Kuiper 1916, 425, comparing (*inter alia*) Hdt. 1.29-33);

fr. 4 Powell (4 Gerhard 1909) *ap.* Ath. 11.91, 495D (contra Hutchinson's suggestion (1988, 52): same anecdote as Call. *Iamb.* 1(fr. 191 Pfeiffer).32sqq (q.v.).

Phylarchus

Phylarch. *FGrHist*81F1 *ap.* Ath. 8.9, 334AB (contra Karadagli 1981,

92): anecdote, including riddle (αἰνιττόμενος; cf. Van Dijk 1994b, 119, n. 1);

ib.F28 (contra Hausrath 1909, col. 1726; cf. Megas 1960, 205; Jedrkiewicz 1989, 416): non-metaphorical report of an (allegedly) real (if miraculous) incident (cf. ib.F27 *ap.* Ael. *NA* 17.5; Plin. *NH* 10.96.208; Lissone, F.L.V.M., *De fragmenten van de geschiedschrijver Phylarchus*, diss. Nijmegen: Berkhout 1969, 135), which may be *compared* with *Aes.* 176 (e.g. *fab. aes.* 62, 186 Hausrath) (Van Dijk 1994b, 124, n. 57).

[Pigres]

[Pigres] *ap. Sudam*, π 1551 Adler: see above, [Hom.] *Marg.*, *Batr.*

Pindarus

Pi. (contra Traversa 1991, 267): no fables to be found (see below);

I. 4.49-52 (contra Von Wilamowitz-Möllendorff 1922, 340; Duchemin 1975/1976, 33, n. 14; Villemonteix 1991, 148, 150): present tense comparison to animal behaviour (εἰκὼς; cf. Σ *ad loc.* (77b τοιοῦτος...οἷοι...ὡς, πολλάκις; 77c ἐοικέναι, *ind. praes.*); Huschke 1810, p. CCXXIIIsq; Farnell 1932, 353; Sandys, J., *The Odes of Pindar...*, Loeb, 19372 (rev. ed.; repr. 1978), 465, n. 2); Thummer, E., *Pindar. Die Isthmischen Gedichte*, II, Heidelberg: Winter 1969, 75; Köhnken, A., *Die Funktion des Mythos bei Pindar*, Berlin/New York: De Gruyter 1971, 115; Willcock 1995, 82;

N. 3.80-83 (contra Duchemin's suggestion (1970, p. XX)): metaphor (cf. B. 5.16-30; Norwood 1945, 82; Woodbury, L., "The epilogue of Pindar's *Second Pythian*", *TAPhA* 76, 1945, 28; Jaeger, W., *Paideia. Die Formung des Griechischen Menschen*, I[4], Berlin 1959, 289; Ruck, C.A.P., "Marginalia Pindarica", *Hermes* 100, 1972, 158, 160-161; Stoneman 1976, 193-194; Bernardini, P.A., "L'aquila tebana vola ancora", *QUCC* 26, 1977, 121-126; Kirkwood 1982, 76; Steiner 1986, 105-106; Pfeiffer, I.L., "The Image of the Eagle in Pindar and Bacchylides", *CPh* 89, 1994, 313-315; Willcock 1995, 164);

O. 2.87-88 (contra Duchemin's suggestion (1970, p. XX); cf. Kirkwood, G.M., "Pindar's Ravens (*Olymp.* 2.87)", *CQ* 31, 1981,

242; Willcock 1995, 163): comparison (ὡς; Farnell 1932, 22; Norwood 1945, 82; Leeuwen, J. van, *Pindarus' Tweede Olympische Ode*, I, Assen: Van Gorcum/Prakke&Prakke 1964, 238-239; Steiner 1986, 102; cf. Ruck, art. cit., 167; Stoneman 1976, 190-191; Kirkwood 1982, 76; Most, G.W., "Pindar, *O.* 2.83-90", *CQ* 36, 1986, 314; Pfeiffer, *art. cit.*, 311-313);

ib. 11.19-21 (contra Rohde 1888, 305; Villemonteix 1991, 150; Willcock 1995, 59, 163): parallel drawn from nature (cf. Archibald 1912, 57; Kirkwood 1982, 114; Lasserre 1984, 68, n. 8; Steiner 1986, 101-102; Verdenius, W.J., *Commentaries on Pindar*, II, Leiden/New York/København/Köln: Brill 1988, 94: "gnome");

P. 2.55, 72, 78 (contra Huschke 1810, pp. CCXXIXsqq; Keller 1861-1867, 383; Dressel 1876, 21; Ulbricht 1908, 9; Hausrath 1909, col. 1727; Luria 1961, 194; Burton 1962, 124, 127; Lefkowitz, M.R., *The Victory Ode*, Park Ridge, NJ 1976, 26-28, 32-39; Rankin, H.D., *Archilochus of Paros*, ibid. 1977, 93; id. 1975, 254-255; Burnett 1983, 58-59; Hubbard, Th. K., "Hieron and the Ape in Pindar, *Pythian* 2.72-73", *TAPhA* 120, 1990, 76-77; cf. McDermott 1935, 169; Lasserre 1950, 310; García Gual 1970, 426-427; id. 1972, 457, n. 2; Kirkwood 1982, 157; Slings, S.R., "Once More Archilochus and the Ant", *ZPE* 53, 1983, 32; Rosen 1984, 393, n. 16): connection with Archil. 4F2 remains somewhat speculative (in spite of Eust. *in* Pi., *Prooem.* 7.2 (p. 9 Kambylis)), since, first, three elements placed apart (55 Archil., 72/73 Ape, 78 Fox) have to be connected; secondly, the key-word κερδοῖ remains a (Huschke's) conjecture—for all its ingenuity (cf. Lloyd-Jones, H., "Modern Interpretation of Pindar: The Second Pythian and Seventh Nemean Odes", *JHS* 93, 1973, 124); thirdly, the animal metaphors, as well as the reference to Archilochus as a poet of abuse, are understandable in themselves (cf. Denis 1883, 237-238, n. 3; Gildersleeve, B.L., *The Olympian and Pythian Odes*, New York 1890 (repr. Amsterdam: Hakkert 1965), 264; Goddard, E.H., "Pindar, Pythian II", *CR* 36, 1922, 105-106; Von Wilamowitz-Möllendorff 1922, 291, n. 1; Immisch 1930/1931, 6, n. 1 referring to Schroeder; Norwood, G., "Pindar, *Pythian*, II, 72 ff.", *AJPh* 62, 1941, 340; Wyckoff, E., "Pindar *Pythian* 2.52-56", *CPh* 41, 1946, 161; Gerber, D.E., "Pindar, *Pythian* 2.56", *TAPhA* 91, 1960, 108; Bowra, C.M., *Pindar*, Oxford 1964, 135-137; Martin, J., "La 2e Pythique de Pindare", *REG* 82, 1969, pp. XXIIIsq; Thummer 1972,

297, 299-301; Péron, J., "Pindare et Hiéron dans la IIe Pythique (vv. 56 et 72)", *REG* 87, 1974, esp. 8-9, 14-16, 19-20, n. 3; Lee, H.M., "Slander (διαβολή) in Herodotus 7,10,η, and Pindar, Pythian, 2,76", *Hermes* 106, 1978, 280-283; Adrados 1979a, 220; Carey 1981, 53-56; Miller, A.M., "Pindar, Archilochus and Hieron in *P.* 2.52-56", *TAPhA* 111, 1981, 141; Stoneman, R., "The Ideal Courtier. Pindar and Hieron in *Pythian* 2", *CQ* 34, 1984, 45-46; Steiner 1986, 101);

ibid.80 (contra Rankin's suggestion (1975, 255)): comparison (ὥς; cf. 79 ἅτε; Farnell 1932, 133; Thummer 1972, 300; Carey 1981, 57; Most 1987, 569-571);

ibid.84 (contra Rankin's suggestion (1975, 255)): comparison (δίκαν; cf. Von Wilamowitz-Möllendorff 1922, 291, n. 1; Farnell 1932, 131; Thummer 1972, 301; Mainoldi 1984, 128-129);

ibid.90-92 (contra Rankin's suggestion (1975, 255); cf. Miralles, C., "The Iambic Poet as a Wolf", in: id.-Pòrtulas, J., *Archilochus and the Iambic Poetry*, Roma: Ateneo 1983, 55): metaphor (Norwood 1945, 187-190; Thummer 1972, 302, n. 25; Carey 1981, 60-61; Kirkwood 1982, 159; Grimm, R.E., "Pindar: *Pythian* 2.90-92", *AJPh* 107, 1986, 551-560; Most 1987, 571-584);

ibid.94-95 (contra Burton's suggestion (1962, 133)): proverb (Diogenian. 7.84; Greg. Cypr. M 4.100; Macar. 7.44; Apostol. 6.57, 14.100 (Arsen. 22.16, 43.94); Erasm. *Adag.* 1.3.46 (p. 131A-C); Leutsch-Schneidewin *ad* Zen. 5.70; LSJ sv λακτίζω; Salzmann 1910, 75; Dodds 1960, 173; cf. Thummer 1972, 303, 307; Pòrtulas 1978 on ib.84-85 and fr. 235 Bowra *ap.* Ath. 12.7, 513C), applied in, not deriving from, *iamb. adesp.* 13 Diehl (q.v.).

Plato

Pl. *Ap.* 34d: reference to Od. 19.163 (q.v.);

Crat. 397e-398a: quotes Hes. *Op.* 121-123 (q.v.);

ib. 411a (contra Dressel 1876, 27; Neubner 1889, 35-36; Schmidt, O., *Metapher und Gleichnis in den Schriften Lukians*, Winterthur: Ziegler 1897, 82; Salzmann 1910, 79; Méridier, L., *Cratyle* (*Platon. Œuvres complètes* V.2), Budé, 1961[3], 44-45, 92, n. 1; Nøjgaard 1964, 237; Bédier 1969, 103; Scherft, T., *Ongrijpbaar is de Ganges. Fabels uit het Pali*, Amsterdam: Meulenhoff 1981, 31; Van Rooijen-Dijkman 1984, 12; cf. Jacobs 1889, 29; Jedrkiewicz

1989, 377; cf. Erasm. *Adag.* 1.3.66 (p. 138A)): allusion to mythology, not fable (*Aes.* 188, 358)[28], the lion's skin worn by Heracles, not the ass (cf. Adrados 1979a, 220; Schmidt 1987, col. 428);

Grg. 483e-484a (contra Fraenkel 1950, II 342; Dodds 1959, 268-269; Adrados 1965a, 4; Jedrkiewicz 1989, 376; cf. Dierauer 1977, 62-63): simile (ὥσπερ), comparable with, but not alluding to, A. 12F2 (cf. Dyson 1929, 187; Groeneboom 1944, 238, comparing Mart. 2.75, Iuven. 14.246-247), let alone (contra Dodds lc) Arist. 52A1 (Antisth. 48F1);

ib. 493d-494b (contra Wright, R., "How credible are Plato's myths?", in: Bowersock-Burkert-Putnam 1979, 366; Dodds 1959, 304): hypothetical simile (εἰκόνα, εἰ, οἷον εἰ *c. opt.* (*pot.*));

ib. 523a (contra Edelstein 1949, 466): myth (Dodds 1959, 376-377; Stewart 1960, 133-145; Brisson 1982, 135; Droz 1992, 119-125);

ib. 527a (contra Romano 1964, 69): fairy tale (Bolte 1921, 6; cf. Dodds 1959, 385);

Lg. 4, 718e-719a: quotes Hes. *Op.* 289 ἱδρῶτα-292 (q.v.);

ib. 7, 799cd (contra Driesch, R., *Platons Wegbilder*, Diss. Köln 1967, 15-16, n. 3): simile (καθάπερ...ὡσαύτως; England, E.B., *The Laws of Plato*, II, Manchester: UP; London...: Longmans/Green 1921, 261), not allusion to Prodic. *ap.* X. *Mem.* 2.1.21-34 (which is not a fable either; q.v.);

ib. 10, 906d (contra Josifović 1961, 109; id. 1974, col. 34; Jedrkiewicz 1989, 376-377): hypothetical comparison (καθάπερ εἰ *c. opt.* (*pot.*); cf. Mainoldi 1984, 194), not allusion to *Pa.Bodl.* 217 Chambry (*Aes.* 342);

Ly. 214a: quotes Od. 17.218 (q.v.);

Phd. 84e-85b (contra Loriaux 1969, 39): metaphor, based upon (present tense) description of animal behaviour, fabulized into *fab. aes.* 247 (cf. 277) Hausrath (*Aes.* 233, (cf. 399); Adrados 1979a, 419; 1987a, 237-238, 259-260);

Phdr. 241cd (contra Jedrkiewicz's suggestion (1983, 251)): comparison (ὡς...ὡς), not allusion to *fab. aes.* 41 Hausrath (*Aes.* 41; not even featuring a wolf);

ib. 242d: according to Robin (1961, 28-29, n. 3) possibly alluding to *Smp.* 203bc (q.v.);

---

[28] References given above, Sopat. Rh. G58, n. 141.

ib. 247a (contra Wimmel's suggestion (1960, 62)): connection with *Aes.* 100 (*Scol.* 6A1, Arist. 57A2) far-fetched;
ib. 260c: same proverb (Benardete 1991, 167) as Ar. *V.* 191 (q.v.);
ib. 272c (contra Jedrkiewicz's suggestion (1983, 251)): proverb (cf. *App. Prov.* 3.77; Macar. 5.73; Hackforth's translation (1952, 152: "the devil's advocate")), not allusion to *fab. aes.* 160 Hausrath (*Aes.* 155) (rather (49T7, 49T10 (Herm., Σ)); Leutsch-Schneidewin *ad App. Prov.* lc; cf. Thompson 1868, 130) to *Aes.* 453 (Plu. *Mor.* 156A; Phot. sv καὶ τὸ τοῦ λύκου; *Suda*, κ 1209 Adler; Greg. Cypr. L 2.66; Macar. 3.48; see Van Dijk 1994a, 113, n. 56));
ib. 275b (contra Christ-Schmid-Stählin, I 191; Grimaldi 1988, 251; Jedrkiewicz 1989, 304; Giordano 1990, 185, n. 376; cf. Von Bissing 1949, 230, n. 47): remark on Socrates' ability to compose Egyptian "stories" (λόγους) referring to preceding myth of Theuth (for which see, e.g., Brisson 1982, 47-48; Droz 1992, 203-209);
ibid.: variation of same proverbial phrase as in Od. 19.163 (q.v.);
Plt. 272bc (contra Burges 1847, 227; Immisch 1930, 160; Diès 1960, 26; Adrados 1979a, 24; Williams 1981): uncertain whether animal stories (μύθους (bracketed by Burnet following Wohlrab)) are to be identified with fables[29];
Prt. 320c-323a (contra Rutherford 1883, p. XXIX; Ellis 1887, 50); Duff-Duff 1935, 681, n. c; cf. Nestle, W., *Protagoras*, Leipzig/ Berlin: Teubner 19317, 99; Josifović 1974, col. 34; Karadagli 1981, 168-172): myth[30] (cf. Frei, I., *Quaestiones Protagoreae*, Bonn: Marcus 1845, 183, 186; Neubner 1889, 35; Bignone 1938, 22; Séchan, L., *Le mythe de Prométhée*, Paris: PUF 1951 (repr. 1981), 81-82; Stewart 1960, 208-222; Heinimann, F., *Nomos und Physis*, Basel: Reinhardt 1965, 115; Müller, C.W., "Protagoras über die Götter", *Hermes* 95, 1967, 140-159 (repr. in: Classen 1976, 312-340; Dumont 1969, 29, 50; Capizzi 1970, 84-85; Sprague 1972, 24; Strauss 1972, 36; Bodin, L.-Demont, P., *Lire le Protagoras*, Paris: Les Belles Lettres 1975, *passim*; Brisson, L., "Le mythe de Protagoras", *QUCC* 20, 1975, 7-37; Dietz, K.-M., *Protagoras von*

---

[29] Brisson (1982, 78) thinks of myths.

[30] Differently Reinhardt (1927, 233), Gigon (O., "Studien zu Platons *Protagoras*", in: *Phyllobolia. Festschrift für P. von der Mühll*, Basel 1948 (repr. in: *Studien zur antiken Philosophie*, Berlin/New York 1972), 104): "Märchen"; Adam-Adam 1905, p. XXII: "legend" (but elsewhere using "myth" (p. XIX) and "fable" (p. XXI); likewise Frutiger 1930, 182; cf. Schuhl 1947, 29).

Abdera. Untersuchungen zu seinem Denken, Bonn: Habelt 1976, 115-131; Cole, A.Th., "The relativism of Protagoras", *YCS* 22, 1978, 30; Miller, C.L., "The Prometheus Story in Plato's *Protagoras*", *Interpretation* 7.2, 1978, 22-32; Adrados 1979a, 162; Döring, K., "Die politische Theorie des Protagoras", in: Kerferd 1981, 109-111; Kahn, C.H., "The Origins of Social Contract Theory in the fifth Century B.C.", in: Kerferd 1981, 98, 102-103; Brisson 1982, 30; Moors 1982, 47; Capriglione, I.C., "La caverna, l'uomo e la città", in: Casertano, G., *Democrito. Dall' atomo alla città*, Napoli: Loffredo 1983, 145; Bodéüs, R., "L'habile et le juste de l'Antigone de Sophocle au Protagoras de Platon", *Mnemosyne* 37, 1984, 279sqq; Nill 1985, 5, 93 n. 5; Balaban, O., "The Myth of Protagoras and Plato's Theory of Measurement", *HPhQ* 4, 1987, 371-384; De Romilly 1992, 163, 188, 192);

R. 1.22, 350e (contra Wünsche 1905, 2): fairy tales (Bolte 1921, 6);

ib. 2.7, 364cd: quotes Hes. *Op.* 287-289 (q.v.);

ib. 2.8, 365d: see above, Pl. 49A2, n. 133;

ib. 2.16, 377a (contra Dressel 1876, 27; Josifović: 1961, 108): fairy tales[31] (cf. *Hp.Ma.* 286a, *Lg.* 10, 887d; see Neubner 1889, 38 contra Dressel 1876, 27; Couturat 1896, 3; Bolte 1921, 7; Stewart 1989, 262; cf. Adrados 1979a, 26);

ib. 3, 414d-415c (contra Frutiger 1930, 196 (but ib. 235: "mythe"); Chambry-Diès 1959, 137; Josifović; 1961, 109 and 1974, col. 34): myth[32] (cf. Stewart 1960, 421-422; Moors 1982, 51; Smith, J.E., "Plato's Myths as 'Likely Accounts', Worthy of Belief", *Apeiron* 19, 1985, 30-31);

ib. 416a (contra Jedrkiewicz's suggestion (1989, 377): hypothetical simile (cf. Mainoldi 1984, 192-193);

ib. 6.2, 487a (contra Erasm. (49T13)): general reference to mythology, not allusion to particular fable (*in casu* Arist. 57A2 (cf. *Scol.* 6A1));

ib. 8.2, 544d: allusion to Od. 19.163 (q.v.);

Smp. 177b: (probably) alludes to Prodic. *ap.* X. *Mem.* 2.1.21-34 (q.v.);

ib. 189c-193d (contra Frutiger 1930, 182, n. 2, (but ib. 196, 235 "mythe"; likewise Vandvik, E., "De mytho Aristophaneo in Pla-

---

[31] Differently Murray, P., *Plato on Poetry*, Cambridge: UP 1996, 135: "P[l].'s own myths".

[32] Differently Friedländer 1960, 85, 123: "Märchen"; O'Rourke, J., "Mythos and Logos in the *Republic*", *Clio* 16, 1987, 385: "Allegory".

tonis Symposio", *SO* 23, 1944, 102; Karadagli 1981, 172-177; Cascajero 1992, 63); cf. Dover, K., *Plato. Symposium*, Cambridge...: UP 1980, 113: myth[33] (cf. Hani, J., "Le Mythe de l'Androgyne dans le *Banquet* de Platon", *Euphrosyne n.s.* 11, 1981-1982, 89-101; Stewart 1960, 358-369; Stewart 1989, 261; Adrados 1995, 227; Pieper 1965, 49);

ib. 191d (contra Crusius 1890, 34-35): comparison (ὥσπερ; Robin, L., *Le Banquet* (*Platon. Œuvres complètes* 4.2), Budé, 1962⁷ *ad loc.*));

ib. 203bc (contra Rutherford 1883, pp. XXVIIIsq; Ellis 1887, 50; Frutiger 1930, 184, n. 4 (but ib. 198, 240: "mythe"; cf. Karadagli 1981, 177-181); Duff-Duff 1935, 681, n. c; Perry (1952, 505; 1965, 518 (*Aes.* 466)); Josifović 1974, col. 34; Jedrkiewicz 1983, 256; Adrados 1987a, 394-395 and 1993, 12; Cascajero 1992, 63): myth[34] (cf. Neubner 1889, 35; Stewart 1960, 370-384; Rosen, D., *Plato's Symposium*, New Haven/London: Yale UP 1968, 231; Krischer, T., "Diotima und Alkibiades. Zur Struktur des platonischen Symposion", *Grazer Beiträge* 11, 1984, 60);

Tht. 172e: same proverb as Ar. *V.* 375-376 (q.v.);

ib. 174a (cf. Iamb. *Protr.* 14; Aristid. *Or.* 36.85 (p. 290 Keil); Tert. *An.* 8, *Nat.* 2.4; Hippol. *Ref.* 1.4; Olymp. *in Grg.* 26.16; *Gnom. Vat.* 319 Sternbach; Pol. *Lam.*, p. 210 Del Lungo; Blumenberg, H., "Der Sturz des Protophilosophen zur Komik der reinen Theorie — Anhand einer Rezeptionsgeschichte der Thales-Anekdote", in: Preisendanz, W.-Warning, R. (eds.), *Das Komische* (*Poetik und Hermeneutik* VII), München: Fink 1976, 11-64) (contra Baker 1969, 585; Adrados 1979a, 539; Karadagli 1981, 64; Cascajero 1991, 54): anecdote (cf. D.L. 1.1 (340), fabulized into *fab. aes.* 40 Hausrath (*Tetr.* 1.52; *Aes.* 40) (*vice versa* according to Blumenberg, *art. cit.* 17) (cf. Denis 1883, 247; Neubner 1889, 38; La Penna 1961, 506; Adrados 1983b, 28; Jedrkiewicz 1989, 140-141).

---

[33] Differently Reinhardt 1927, 244: "Legende"; Friedländer 1954, 190: "Märchen".

[34] Differently Wienert 1925, 35: "Märchen", "Sage[n]"; Reinhardt 1927, 248: "Legende", "Märchen"; Bury, R.G., *The Symposium of Plato*, Cambridge: Heffer and Sons 1932², p. XL: "*allegory*" (likewise Pieper 1965, 28).

[Plato]

AP 9.44 (translated into Latin by Aus. 14) (contra D.L. 3.33; Jedrkiewicz 1989, 378): cf. *Aes.* 405 (Synt. 48, *Syr.* LXIV, 3 Lefèvre), but either by Statyllius Flaccus (8 Gow-Page; Del Re 1966, 139; Hopkinson, N., *Greek Poetry of the Imperial Period. An Anthology*, Cambridge: UP 1994, 26) or, rather, by Plato Junior (Geffcken 1897, 93, n. 2; Reitzenstein 1893, 184 (cf. eund., "Flaccus" (5), *RE* VI.2, Stuttgart: Metzler 1909, col. 2434); Weinreich 1951, 419-421; Gow-Page 1968, II 455; Page 1981, 82, 125; Lausberg 1982, 367);

ib. 45 (contra Plan. *ad loc.* (see Gow-Page 1968, II 454); cf. Adrados 1991a, 39): variation of ib. 44 (q.v.), but by Statyllius Flaccus (9 Gow-Page).

Plato comicus

Pl. Com. *Περιάλγης*, fr. 114 *PCG ap.* Σ *in* Ar. *Nu.* 109d (*Suda*, φ 125 Adler) (contra Crusius 1890, 35): metaphor (cf. LSJ sv ψῆττα: "a nickname for a *glutton*").

Posidippus

Posidipp. *ἐν τῇ Αἰσωπίᾳ* (Schott's emendation (P., *Posidippi epigrammata collecta et illustrata*, Diss. Berlin 1905, 99sqq; cf. Perry 1952, 219, n. 2; Gow-Page 1965, II 497; Peek, W., "Poseidippos (3)", *RE* XXII.1, Stuttgart: Metzler 1953, col. 439-440) for Athenaeus' *Ἀσωπίᾳ* (11.80, 491C) and *Αἰθιοπίᾳ*[35] (13.69, 596C): it cannot be ascertained whether this epic poem on Aesop (*si vera lectio*; *Aes.* T19) contained (allusions to) fables.

[35] Schott's emendation can be paralleled by the etymological derivation of Αἴσωπος from Αἰθίοψ in Eust. *Od.* α 45sqq; Plan. *Praef. Vit. Aesop.* (*Aes.* T2); cf. Von Bissing 1949, 227; Schipper 1993, 238.

Praxilla

Praxill. 750 *PMG ap.* Σ *in* Ar. *Th.* 528-529: same proverb (LSJ sv σκορπίος) as *Scol.* 903 *PMG* (q.v.).

Priscian

Prisc. *Praeex.* 2.5: ~ Auct. ad Her. 1.8.13 (q.v.).

Prodicus

Prodic. 84B2 Diels-Kranz *ap.* X. *Mem.* 2.1.21-34 (*et ap.* Cic. *Off.* 1.32.118; Max. Tyr. 14.1-2; Philostr. *Ep.* 73, *VA* 6.10; Ath. 12.2, 510C; Clem. Al. *Paed.* 2.10.110 (εἰκόνας), *Strom.* 5.5.31 (664); Them. *Or.* 22, 280a-282a; Jul. *Or.* 3(2).7 (56d), *Or.* 7 (217a); Σ *in* Ar. *Nu.* 361a; *Sudam,* π 2366 Adler; cf. Pl. *Smp.* 177B, Ceb. 18, D.Chr. 1.65-84 (Max. Ath. Clem. Jul. (56d) μῦθος)) (contra Pearson 1917, II 30; Lattimore, R., *Story Patterns in Greek Tragedy*, London: Athlone P 1964, 29[36]; Adrados 1979a, 416; cf. Alpers, J., *Hercules in bivio*, Diss. Göttingen: Dieterich 1912, *passim*; Adrados 1980, 174): see X. lc.

Protagoras

Protag. 80C1 Diels-Kranz *ap.* Pl. *Prt.* 320c-323a, Him. *Or.* 68.10: see Pl. lc (cf. Adrados 1980, 174).

Pseudo-Callisthenes

Ps.-Callisth. 1.14.4 (contra Adrados 1978b, 44; 1985, 340; 1987a, 64-65): legendary episode from Alexander's life, probably inspired by Pl. *Tht.* 174a (q.v.; Van Dijk 1996a, 519-520);

1.36-39 (contra Karadagli 1981, 93-94): anecdote, including symbolic action (cf. Van Dijk 1994b, 119, n. 1);

---

[36] But ib. 88, n. 74: "parable".

2.16.3 (contra Adrados 1978a, 311, n. 6; 1979a, 548; 1985, 340; 1987a, 376): comparison (Van Dijk 1996a, 520);

3.6.13 (contra Adrados 1979a, 548; 1985, 340; 1987a, 186): comparison (Van Dijk 1996a, 520).

Quintilian

Quint. 2.4.2: ~ Auct. ad Her. 1.8.13 (q.v.).

scholia in Dionysium Thracem

Σ *in* D.T. *Περὶ προσῳδιῶν* (Hld.), p. 449 Hilgard: ~ Auct. ad Her. 1.8.13 (q.v.).

scholia in Terentium

Σ *in* Ter. p. 167 Schlee: ~ auct. ad Her. 1.8.13 (q.v.).

Scolia

Scol. 903 *PMG ap.* Ath. 15, 695d (contra Dalfen 1994/1995, 173, n. 27): metaphorical proverb (Zen. 6.20; Diogenian. 8.59; Ael. *HA* 15.26; *Suda*, υ 674 Adler; Hsch. υ 717 Schmidt; Greg. Cypr. 3.88; Macar. 8.69; Apostol. 17.61 (Arsen. 51.69); Gow-Scholfield *ad* Nic. *Ther.* 19; Campbell 1982-1993, IV 378 (referring also to *Anecd. Gr.* (De Villoison II 177)) and V 291, n. 1; Reitzenstein 1893, 18);

ib. 912 (contra Dalfen 1994/1995, 173, n. 27) *ap.* Ar. *V.* 1240-1241 (q.v.).

Semonides

Semon. fr. 7 West (contra Neubner 1889, 12; Hausrath 1909, col. 1706-1707; Giangrande 1972, 20; Diez-Bauer 1973, 171; Snell, B., *Die Entdeckung des Geistes. Studien zur Entstehung des europäischen*

Denkens bei den Griechen, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht 19805, 191-192; cf. Lilja 1976, 44): common animal imagery, which does certainly not necessarily presuppose fables, although correspondences do exist (see Opitz, R., "Über den 'Weiberspiegel' des Semonides von Amorgos", *Philologus* 50 (*n.s.* 4), 1891, 13-30; cf. Crusius 1913, pp. XIIIsq.; Wienert 1925, 36, n. 4; Lesky 1957/1958, 108; Nøjgaard 1964, 533; Verdenius, W.J., "Semonides über die Frauen", *Mnemosyne*, *s. IV*[a], 21, 1968, 157; Lloyd-Jones, H., *Females of the Species. Semonides on Women*, London: Duckworth 1975, 21; Adrados 1979a, 213-214; Campbell 1983, 140-141; Lasserre 1984, 88; Easterling (1989a, 141; "Semonides", in: id.-Knox 1989, I.1, 115);

fr. 8 West: see above, Semon. 5F1, n. 94;

fr. 11 West *ap.* Ath. 2.50, 57D (cf. Eust. *Od.* λ 302) (contra suggestions by Keller 1861-1867, 383; Lasserre 1984, 65; Jedrkiewicz (1986, 147, n. 1; 1989, 326); Cascajero 1991, 22): comparison (οἷόν τε) (cf. Neubner 1889, 11-12), not fragment of *Aes.* 87[37].

Sextus Empiricus

S.E. *M.* 1.263-264: ~ auct. ad Her. 1.8.13 (q.v.).

Simonides[38]

Simon. fr. 10 *PMG* (contra Adrados' suggestion (1979a, 413); cf. Jedrkiewicz 1989, 331): simply mock-epitheton of mules, perfectly understandable in itself, though *comparable* with *Aes.* 315[39] (cf. Mosino 1978, 93-96).

---

[37] Babr. 123; *fab. aes.* 89 Hausrath; Avian. 33; *Dod.* 288 Chambry; *Branc.* 9; Synt. 27; *Syr.* XXX, 32 Lefèvre; *Tetr.* 1.37 (Adrados 1987a, 104-105, 427 (medieval versions)).

[38] Cf. above, Simon. 9F1, n. 169.

[39] Plu. *Mor.* 150AB, Babr. 62, *fab. aes.* 285 Hausrath, *Pa.Bodl.* 129 Chambry (Adrados 1987a, 265).

[Simonides]

[Simon.] 59 Page (2 Gow-Page), *AP* 6.217[40] (*et ap. Sudam* svv κ 1050 (1-2), α 3019, β 473 (3-4), η 482 (5-6), λ 147 (9-10), ο 540 (9 ὅς-10), ε 1196 (10); cf. Phot. sv Κύβηβον) (contra Perry 1965, 508 (*Aes.* 436); Adrados 1987a, 309): dedicatory epigram (*lemm. ad loc.* ἀνάθημα; cf. Antist. 1 Gow-Page, *AP* 6.237), (allegedly), neither fictitious nor metaphorical (9-10 τάδε...ἐκρέμασε; see also above, Antip. Sid. 27F2).

Socrates

Socr. (contra Burges 1845, 227-230; 1847, 227-228): μῦθος, ὃν τῶν οὐκ ἀμούσων ἀνδρῶν τις ἐντείνας ἔπεσι διεσκεύασεν *ap.* Gal. *Protr.* 13 rather by a contemporary of Galen's (Gerhard 1909, 267) than by Socrates;

Socr. *ap.* D.L. 2.5 (33), Plu. *Mor.* 141D (contra Adrados 1979a, 395; Cascajero 1991, 30): anecdote about advice (cf. Gal. *Protr.* 8 τῷ παλαιῷ παραγγέλματι; Apu. *Apol.* 15), fabulized into Phaedr. 3.8 (*Aes.* 499) (but not into *fab. aes.* 53 Hausrath (*Aes.* 53)) (cf. Adrados 1987a, 410);

see also above, Babr. G19a, n. 45; below, under Thgn. 1135-1150.

Solon

Sol. fr. 11 West *ap.* D.S. 9.20.2, D.L. 1.2 (52), Plu. *Sol.* 30 (contra Rutherford 1883, pp. XXVII, XLVIII; Jacobs 1889, 28; Hausrath 1909, col. 1706; id. 1918, 46-47; Wienert 1925, 53, n. 2; Oldaker 1933/1934, 92; Nestle 1942, 73, n. 79; Lasserre 1948, 13; id. 1984, 89-90; Adrados 1985, 245; Cascajero 1991, 23; Holzberg 1993, 15): metaphor (cf. Denis 1883, 237; Salzmann 1910, 78; Garbugino 1984, 38-39; Rihll, T.E., "Lawgivers and Tyrants (Solon, frr. 9-11 West)", *CQ* 39, 1989, 279), the fox being a symbol of slyness (cf. Pelissier, R., *De Solone verborum copia*, Diss. Berlin 1911, 3; García Gual 1970, 425; Gerber 1970,

[40] This epigram is apocryphal; see Hauvette, A., *De l'authenticité des épigrammes de Simonide*, Paris: Alcan 1896, 24, 27, 40; Page 1981, 282.

136; Campbell 1983, 96), not the protagonist of a particular fable (*in casu Aes.* 142[41]; Defradas, J., *Les élégiaques grecs*, Paris: PUF 1962, 54; cf. Adrados 1990, I 194, n. 4).

[Solon]

iamb. adesp. 12 Diehl (contra Crusius, O., "Ad poetas Latinos exegetica", *RhM* 44, 1889, 459-460; "Religionsgeschichtliches und Litterarisches aus den Paroemiographen", *SB* München, *phil.-hist. Kl.* 1910.4.62-63 (cf. Gerhard 1909, 268, n. 3; Diehl *in app. crit.*), ingeniously combining (comparing Quint. G18b) Macar. 7.75 and Diogenian. 7.9 (Apostol. 13.46 (Arsen. 41.25)), so as to elaborate (whatever the order (contra Führer 1967, 55, n. 58)) two proverbs into one miniature fable): ascription unfounded;

ib. 13 *ap.* Prisc. *Inst.* 18.281 (3.356 Keil) (contra Crusius lc; cf. Gerhard 1909, 268, n. 3; Diehl *in app. crit.*; Buecheler, F., "Coniectanea", *RhM* 34, 1879, 341)): elaboration of metaphorical proverb (*et ap.* Pi. *P.* 2.94-95; q.v.) into miniature fable, but attribution to Sol. without foundation.

Sophocles

S. *Ant.* 710-714 (contra Keller 1861-1867, 383, n. 98; Dressel 1876, 27; Fischer 1905, 18; Kovacs 1950, 21; Holbek 1962, 53; Bédier 1969, 103; Schwarzbaum 1979, p. XLI n. 24, 163; Schadewaldt 1982, 46; Cascajero 1991, 29; cf. Adrados 1965b; id. 1979a, 156; id. 1987a, 231; Brown, A.S., *Antigone*, Warminster: Aris & Phillips 1987, 182; Jedrkiewicz 1989, 359, n. 44): present tense simile (cf. Adrados 1987a, 89), based upon observation (712 ὁρᾷς; cf. ib.715-717, 474-478 (476 εἰσίδοις!); Dodds 1960, 114) of natural phenomenon (cf. Neubner 1889, 29-30; Lloyd 1966, 388, n. 2), *comparable* with (Jebb, R.C., *Sophocles*, III: *The Antigone*, Cambridge: UP 19003 (repr. Amsterdam: Servio 1962), 133), not alluding to, *Aes.* 70[42];

---

[41] References given above, Pl. 49A1, nn. 111, 114.
[42] References given above, n. 9.

Αἰχμαλωτίδες, fr. 37 Radt *ap.* Σ *in* Nic. *Ther.* 19 (cf. Zen. 6.20): same proverb as *Scol.* 903 *PMG* (q.v.);
fr. 331 Radt (contra Irmscher 1987, 6): same proverb as Ar. *V.* 191 (q.v.; Karadagli 1981, 51);
fr. 885 Radt *ap.* Σ *in* Ar. *Eq.* 1031, 1068; Suet. *Περὶ βλασφημιῶν* 93 Taillardat; Eust. *Od.* p. 1493.22 (contra Adrados 1987a, 147; Jedrkiewicz 1989, 359, n. 44; Cascajero 1991, 29): proverb (ΣΣ llcc: παροιμία[ν]; Zen. 4.90; *Suda*, λ 178 (παροιμία), σ 171 Adler; cf. Ar. llcc; Phryn. *PS* 87; [Hdn.] *Philet.* 150; Hsch. λ 806 Latte; *EM*, *Et. Gen.*, *Et. Gud.* sv λαίθαργος; Pearson and Radt *ad loc.*), fabulized into Babr. 87 (*Aes.* 136; cf. Rutherford 1883, p. XLVI with n. 3).

Sotades

Sotad. *ap. Sudam*, σ 871 Adler: see above, Chapter I.III, n. 140.

Stesichorus

Stesich. *ap.* Arist. *Rh.* 2.21, 1395a1-2 (17, fr. 281(b) *PMG*) (contra Vürtheim 1919, 80; cf. Kleine 1828, 112-113; Bowra 1961, 426): apophthegm (Hinman 1935, 73);
ib. 3.11, 1412a23-24: id. (Hinman lc).

Surdinus

Surdinus *ap.* Sen. *Suas.* 7.12 (contra Roth 1846, 538, n. 15): *Graecae fabulae eleganter in Latinum sermonem conversae* probably being "plays" (Winterbottom, M., *The Elder Seneca*, II, Loeb, 1974, 609) rather than fables.

Thales

Thales *ap.* Pl. *Tht.* 174A, D.L. 1.1 (34): see Pl. lc.

Themistocles

See above, Arist. 39F2, n. 9.

[Themistocles]

[Themist.] *Ep.* 9, p. 750 Hercher (contra Adrados' suggestion (1987a, 165)): present tense simile, not allusion to *fab. aes.* 155 Hausrath (*Aes.* 150).

Theocritus[43]

Theoc. 1.48-54 (contra Huschke 1810, p. CCXLIX; Campbell, A.Y., "The Boy, the Grapes, and the Foxes", *CQ* 25, 1931, 90-102; cf. Knox, A.D., "The Fox and the Grapes", *CQ* 25, 1931, 205-211; Adrados 1985, 340): description cup (cf. Gow, A.S.F., "The Cup in the First Idyll of Theocritus", *JHS* 33, 1913, 207-222; Paar, I., "Champs lexicaux et esthétique littéraire. Théocrite, Idylle I, v. 27-56", *LEC* 57, 1989, 13-26; Vara 1992, 340);

5.38 (contra Köhler's suggestion (1881, 192)): proverb (cf. Σ *ad loc.*: παροιμία; metre: paroemiac), comparable with, not alluding to, *fab. aes.* 225, 276 Hausrath (*Aes.* 209, 267, 366), or A. 12F2 (Gow *ad loc.* (adducing *inter alia* Od. 21.363-364) contra Ahrens);

14.43 (contra Cholmeley, R.J., *The Idylls of Theocritus*, London: Bell 19192, 290-291; cf. Gow *ad loc.*): proverb (Waltz 1906, 119, n. 4; Heimgartner 1940, *passim*; *DGE* sv αἶνος; ἔβα *aoristus gnomicus*?), based upon bull's behaviour (Van Dijk 1993d, 172, n. 3; cf. S. *OT* 477-478; Couat, A., *La poésie alexandrine sous les trois premiers Ptolémées*, Paris 1882 (English translation by Loeb, J., London 1931 (repr. Chicago: Ares 1991)), 466; Fraenkel, J.M.-Groeneboom, P., *Sophocles' Oedipus Rex*, Groningen/Batavia: Noordhoff 1949, 76; Allen, A., "A Bull in Sophocles: O.T. 478", *Classical*

[43] Rosenmeyer's explanation (T.G., *The Green Cabinet. Theocritus and the European Pastoral Lyric*, Berkeley/Los Angeles: U of California P 1969, 144) for the absence of fables from Theocritus' *Idylls* (as well as from Virgil's (but not from Spenser's) *Eclogues*)—"both the moralizing and the exploitation of animal archetypes go against the grain of the pastoral idea", according to which "the animals are free"—is based upon too narrow a conception of the genre's characters and function (see the Synthesis above).

Views n.s. 2, 1983, 382-383); Theoc. 9.5, 25.132 (with Gow *ad loc.*); Arist. *HA* 572b16; it should be noted that the typical ποκα is (Meineke's) conjecture (cf. above, Call. *Aet.* fr. 1.10 Pfeiffer δρῦν; Pi. *P.* 2.78 κερδοῖ));

21 (contra Adrados 1979a, 63, cf. 416): wondrous dream report, not fable;

[24.86-87] (contra Crusius 1896, col. 2662): typical ἀδύνατον (cf. Ar. *Pax* 1076-1077, 1112 (q.v.); LXX *Is.* 11.6, 65.25; Verg. *E.* 5.60; Diogenian. 5.96 (Leutsch-Schneidewin *ad loc.* comparing Pl. *Phdr.* 241cd (q.v.)); Lact. *Inst.* 7.24; Apostol. 14.96; Gow 1952, 429), not allusion to source of Babr. 102 (*Aes.* 334), comparable with Antisth. 48F1 (Arist. 52A1).

Theodorus Gadareus

Theodor. Gad. *ap.* Suet. *Tib.* 57, Erasm. *Adag.* 2.10.39 (p. 692F) (contra Perry 1962, 305; Adrados (1987a, 396; 1987c, 9)): allusion to (variation of) mythical concept of man as created from clay (and water (αἵματι ~ ὕδατι (cf. Perry lc!)); cf. Call. 20F1.3; Pitiscus, Σ *ad loc.* (in: *Caji Suetonii Tranquilli Opera...*, Trajecti ad Rhenum: Halma 1690, I 710: "abstracta pro...concretis posita"), referring to Causaubonus, comparing Alex. Aeg. *ap. Sudam*, α 1128 Adler), not to *Aes.* 430 (Them. *Or.* 32, 359d *ap.* Stob. 3.1.122; *Cod. par. sup. gr. 134 f.* 270v; cf. Niceph. Greg. *Hist. Byz.* 16.4.3; Nestle 1937).

Theognis

Thgn. (contra Waltz 1906b, 9): does anything but have "l'usage de citer des fables";

17-20 (contra Karadagli 1981, 65): apophthegm or "Spruchvers" (18 ἔπος), not a fictitious story (which a fable typically is);

293-294 (contra Adrados 1990, II, 188, n. 2 (but cf. eund. 1979a, 155); Traversa 1991, 267): present tense description of animal behaviour (cf. García Gual 1970, 429), not allusion to particular fable (*in casu Aes.* 142)[44];

[44] References given above, Pl. 49A1, nn. 111, 114.

329-330 (contra Perry 1965, p. XXXI; Jedrkiewicz (1983, 262; 1986, 147, n. 2)): *Hineininterpretieren*, judicial context: suit, no pursuit (as in *Aes.* 226)[45];

347-348 (contra Bowra 1961, 290-291; Campbell 1967, 365 and 1983, 109; Lilja 1976, 43 (asserting that the fable allegedly alluded to (*Aes.* 133) "has not survived"); Lasserre 1984, 90; Adrados 1985, 245 (cf. 1965b; 1978d, 227); Jedrkiewicz 1989, 332; Cascajero 1991, 23; Holzberg 1993, 15; cf. Hudson-Williams, T., *The Elegies of Theognis...*, London: Bell 1910, 199): metaphor (cf. Carrière 1948, 107; Garzya 1958, 196; Murray, R.D., Jr., "Theognis 341-50", *TAPhA* 94, 1965, 277-281, conjecturing ἀποτεισόμενος instead of ἀποσεισάμενος; Van Groningen 1966, 139; West 1974, 153: "Commentators are curiously slow to recognize a dog's invariable action on emerging from water"; Mainoldi 1984, 146-147; Adrados 1987b, 142 and 1990, II 192, n. 1 contra Allen, *RPh* 72, 1946, 28; Cerri, G., "Congettura a Teognide 347-348", in: Boldrini *et al.* 1987, 63: δ' ἐκνέων instead of δὲ κύων);

376 ~ *iamb. adesp.* fr. 55a.2 West (q.v.; Adrados 1990, II 309, n. 15);

407-408 (contra Carrière *s.a.*, 170; 1948, 108): considering this distich to be the *réplique finale* of Babr. 119, *fab. aes.* 132, 256 or 262 Chambry (112, 227, 184 Hausrath; *Aes.* 285, 110, 236, 174) (let alone of Babr. 99 (*Aes.* 111) tantamount to wishful thinking (cf. Garzya 1958, 205; Van Groningen 1966, 161);

453-456 (contra Carrière's suggestion (*s.a.*, 170; 1948, 109)): interpretation as fragment of fable comparable with *fab. aes.* 40 Chambry (9 Hausrath; *Aes.* 9) far-fetched;

595-598 (contra Carrière 1948, 109): I do not see why this quatrain "n'est sans doute...qu'un fragment de fable";

601-602 (contra Dressel 1877, 21; Jacobs 1889, 28; Hausrath *ad fab. aes.* 186; Carrière 1948, 114; Karadagli 1981, 120, n. 1; Lasserre 1984, 90; Adrados 1985, 245; id. 1987a, 81; id. 1990, II 208, n. 3[46]; Jedrkiewicz 1989, 332): metaphor (cf. Neubner 1889, 20; Bédier 1969, 104, n. 2), the snake being a symbol of the addressee's chilliness and faithlessness (cf. Garzya 1958, 226; West 1974 *ad loc.*; Campbell 1983, 139; Van Dijk 1994b,

---

[45] References given above, Achae. 15A1, nn. 17-18.

[46] Adopting (like Karadagli lc; cf. Rutherford 1883, pp. XXXIIsq, n. 2; Bergk II 173; Salzmann 1910, 84) Sintenis' conjecture (ὃν...εἶχον), whereas Lasserre (lc) maintains the original reading (ὃς...εἶχες); cf. Van Groningen 1966, 240.

124, n. 57), not the protagonist of a particular fable (*in casu Aes.* 176 (e.g. *fab. aes.* 62, 186 Hausrath));

1135-1150 (contra Carrière *s.a.*, 172-174; 1948, 130; cf. Schrijen, J.J.A., *Elpis. De voorstelling van de hoop in de Griekse literatuur tot Aristoteles*, Groningen: Wolters 1965 (diss. Amsterdam), 50, n. 3): Ἐλπίς theme *comparable* with, not going back to, *Pa. Bodl.* 124 Chambry (*Aes.* 274);

1195-1196 (contra Carrière's suggestion (*s.a.*, 170; 1948, 131)): advice, *à la rigueur* comparable with *fab. aes.* 248 Chambry (67 Hausrath; *Aes.* 66; cf. Van Groningen 1966, 433).

Theophrastus[47]

Ἀκίχαρος ap. D.L. 5.2 (50) (contra Priest's suggestion (1985, 54); cf. Brunner 1980, 199 (see above, Leon. 26F1, n. 25)): unclear (if not impossible) whether this work contained any fables, as only its title is known (cf. Nöldeke 1913, 20-21, doubting the ascription; Donzelli 1960, 238; Perry 1965, p. LX; Jedrkiewicz 1989, 72, n. 10; Wilsdorf 1991).

Xenophanes

Xenoph. (contra Bergk's suggestion (*ap.* Dressel 1876, 15, n. 14)) [*ap.* Gal. *Protr.* 13]: see above, under "Socr.";

21B15 Diels-Kranz *ap.* Clem. Alex. *Strom.* 5.110 (contra Burges 1845, 228-229): hypothetical comparison, *comparable* with *fab. aes.* 264 Hausrath (*Aes.* 284) (Adrados 1978b, 44; 1979a, 420; 1987a, 250; Moretti 1984, 72-73; cf. Bakker, R.-Delfgauw, B., *Xenophanes van Colophon. Tegen de fabels* [!] *van weleer*, Kampen 1987, 56-57).

[47] Fortenbaugh (1995) connects the anecdote in fr. 709 (id. *et al.* (eds.), *Theophrastus of Eresus. Sources for his Life, Writings, Thought and Influence*, Leiden: Brill 1992) with Arist. 39F1-2 and other fables.

Xenophon

X. *Mem.* 2.1.21-34 (*et ap.* Stob. 3.1.205) (contra Jacoby 1908, 32; Gomperz 1912, 97; Waites, M.C., "Some Features of the Allegorical Debate in Greek Literature", *HSCPh* 23, 1912, 9 n. 1, 12, 16; Wright 1913, I 150[48]; Frutiger 1930, 232; Cataudella 1942, 14, n. 17; Kovacs 1950, 25-26; Adam-Adam 1905, 108; Josifoviç; 1974, col. 34; De Romilly 1992, *passim*; cf. Adrados 1987a, 322): allegory[49] (cf. Keller 1861-1867, 383; Waites, *art. cit.* 9-10; Stewart 1960, 238; Perry 1962, 331; Neitzel, H., "Das System der sokratischen Erziehung im 4. Buch der Memorabilien Xenophons", *Gymnasium* 96, 1989, 458), fabulized into *Vit. Aesop.* 94GW (*Aes.* 383; Van Dijk 1995b, 138 and 1996a, 533);

ib. 2.9.2 (contra Gigon 1956, 180): Socratic comparison (present tense!);

Oec. 17.14-15 (contra Josifović; 1974, col. 34): present tense comparison (ὥσπερ *bis*);

Smp. 4.5 (contra Adrados 1979a, 395, 413; cf. eund. 1987a, 179-180): Socratic comparison, λέγονται referring to a reputation, not to a particular story (*in casu fab. aes.* 170 Hausrath (*Aes.* 161)).

---

[48] But ib. II 70: "myth", "allegory", and (like Taplin, O., "Sophocles in his Theatre", in: De Romilly 1983, 161) "parable"!

[49] Differently: Wienert 1925, 37: personification (likewise Nøjgaard 1964, 84-85); Levi, A.-Pesce, D., *Storia della Sofistica*, Napoli: Morano 1966, 245: "mito" (likewise Nestle, W., "Die Horen des Prodikos", *Hermes* 71, 1936, 151-170 (repr. in: Classen 1976, 425-451); Schuhl 1947, 63; Dumont 1969, 122, n. 1; Adrados 1978b, 53; id. 1979a, 630; cf. Neubner 1889, 35).

Dit proefschrift richt zich op de fabels die voorkomen buiten de fabelcollecties, en bestrijkt de Archaïsche, Klassieke en Hellenistische periodes van de Griekse literatuur. Hoewel het hier gaat om de oudste Griekse fabels die bewaard gebleven zijn — de ons overgeleverde antieke fabelverzamelingen dateren alle uit de Keizertijd —, bestond van deze bij tal van auteurs en in diverse literaire genres aan te treffen fabels nog geen compleet overzicht, laat staan een systematische interpretatie. Dit is des te opmerkelijker omdat enerzijds in het verleden meer dan eens is vastgesteld dat zo'n overzicht en studie dringend gewenst waren, terwijl anderzijds juist deze fabels zich bijzonder goed lenen voor onderzoek naar de intertextuele en metaforische relaties tussen de fabels en hun specifieke context. Dergelijk onderzoek concentreert zich op een voor het genre van de fabel relevant aspect: fabels zijn namelijk gebruiksvoorwerpen, in die zin dat ze in eerste instantie bedoeld zijn om toegepast te worden in een bepaalde context of situatie; de eerste fabelverzamelingen dienden eenvoudig het gemak van ieder die voor een of ander doel op zoek was naar een concrete fabel.

Het boek bestaat uit drie delen, voorafgegaan door een algemene inleiding. Deel I vormt het theoretisch kader; deel II geeft een functionele analyse van de fabels in de betreffende periodes van de Griekse literatuur; deel III is een verzameling van alle in het voorafgaande bestudeerde teksten.

Een grondige bestudering van de theorie en terminologie van de fabel was noodzakelijk omdat in het algemeen, met name met het oog op de bonte inhoud van de fabelverzamelingen, het genre van de fabel erg lastig te definiëren is, terwijl meer in het bijzonder het specifieke voorwerp van onderzoek — de niet in verzamelingen opgenomen fabels — een stevig theoretisch fundament behoeft; immers, de verzameling is niet gegeven, maar moet worden samengesteld op grond van duidelijke criteria.

Dit theoretisch onderzoek is zelf weer driedelig: achtereenvolgens worden de moderne theorie, de antieke theorie en de antieke terminologie van de fabel besproken. In het hoofdstuk over de moderne theorie passeren zeventwintig, onderling vaak sterk uiteenlopende fa-

beltheorieën de revue, deels afkomstig uit de klassieke filologie, deels uit andere wetenschappelijke disciplines. Op grond van een kritische doxografie wordt geconcludeerd dat een dynamische genreconceptie het meest recht doet aan de historisch gegroeide verscheidenheid van de fabel. De problematische diversiteit van de inhoud van de fabelcollecties is het best te verstaan als een thematische en structurele eenheid, waarvan noch de personages noch de mogelijke functies a priori moeten worden beperkt. Het tweede hoofdstuk biedt een (nog niet eerder bij elkaar gebrachte) verzameling en bespreking van een honderdtal theoretische passages uit de klassieke oudheid die betrekking hebben op de fabel; opvallend hierbij is dat de voornaamste conclusies van het onderzoek naar de moderne theorie kunnen worden bevestigd. In het derde hoofdstuk wordt de antieke terminologie van de fabel bestudeerd. Hierbij komt de polysemie van de verschillende Griekse en Latijnse termen duidelijk naar voren, die enigszins kan worden gereduceerd door een verbinding met de naam van Aesopus, de legendarische fabelverteller.

De bevindingen van de eerste drie hoofdstukken worden samengevoegd in een Synthese, waarin de fabel wordt gedefinieerd als een fictief, metaforisch verhaal. Deze definitie is van de ene kant ruim genoeg om het leeuwedeel van de in de loop der tijden in fabelcollecties opgenomen of op de een of andere manier aan Aesopus toegeschreven verhalen te omvatten, en van de andere kant duidelijk genoeg om de fabel te onderscheiden van aanverwante (sub)genres en andere vormen van metaforisch taalgebruik als het spreekwoord, de vergelijking, de anekdote en de mythe.

In het tweede deel worden de op de hierboven kort samengevatte theoretische grondslag verzamelde fabels behandeld, die voorkomen in de Archaïsche, Klassieke en Hellenistische Griekse literatuur. Elk van de twaalf hoofdstukken is gewijd aan de fabels die aan te treffen zijn in één bepaald literair genre. Achtereenvolgens komen aan de orde: epos, lyriek, tragedie, komedie, satyrspel, Hellenistische poëzie, epigram, historiografie, retorisch en oratorisch proza, filosofie, wetenschappelijk proza, grammatica & scholia; in totaal gaat het om 61 auteurs. Allusies (zinspelingen op een bepaalde fabel door een auteur) en testimonia (latere verwijzingen naar de betreffende fabel of allusie) worden ook in het onderzoek betrokken. Steeds wordt getracht aan alle mogelijke aspecten van de functies van de fabels binnen hun respectievelijke context aandacht te besteden en aldus het inzicht in en begrip van de betreffende tekst te vergroten. Het trekken van

brede, algemeen geldige conclusies wordt wel eens bemoeilijkt door de schaarste van het materiaal of het lacuneuze van de overlevering. Toch komen enkele grote lijnen duidelijk naar voren, zoals bijvoorbeeld de frappante overeenkomst in het gebruik van fabels conform de retorische theorie door zowel historiografen als redenaars voor een toespraak, gehouden door een individu voor een grotere groep; de uiterst originele en komische wijze waarop Aristophanes omgaat met het in zijn tijd kennelijk zeer populaire genre; de toepasselijke selectie van quasi-wetenschappelijke fabels in Aristoteles' wetenschappelijk proza; het ontbreken van een specifieke context in de Hellenistische epigrammen. Veel fabels worden gekenmerkt door ongespecificeerde personages of een onbepaalde tijds- of plaatsbepaling. De analogie tussen fabel en context kan op allerlei manieren zijn aangegeven, variërend van expliciete aanwijzingen en duidelijke tekstuele signalen tot het meer subtiel in elkaar overlopen van fabel en context. De functies van de fabels binnen hun context zijn zeer divers, uiteenlopend van persuasief en satirisch tot illustratief en verklarend, in verschillende combinaties. De selectie van de fabelpersonages alleen al (en daarmee van de fabel zelf) geeft in vele gevallen een stille, min of meer taktische hint aangaande de boodschap van de fabel.

De volgorde waarin de teksten die zijn verzameld in deel III zijn afgedrukt correspondeert met die van de voorafgaande delen. Alle teksten zijn steeds eenvoudig met de bijbehorende analyses te vergelijken door een consequent doorgevoerde nummering, gebaseerd op een twee- of driedelige code bestaande uit een van de letters G, F, A, of T (Genretheorie en -terminologie, Fabel, Allusie, of Testimonium) en een of twee nummers (voor de auteur en/of de passage in kwestie).

Het boek wordt besloten door een thematisch geordende bibliografie, drie verschillende indices en een appendix, waarin het uitsluiten van door anderen in de loop der tijden expliciet als fabel gekwalificeerde passages wordt verantwoord.

CURRICULUM VITAE

Gert-Jan van Dijk werd geboren op 21 mei 1963 te 's-Hertogenbosch. Zijn middelbare schoolopleiding volgde hij, inmiddels woonachtig te Grave, aan het Kruisheren Kollege te Uden, waar hij in 1981 het vwo-diploma behaalde. Daarna koos hij voor een studie Klassieke Talen aan de Katholieke Universiteit Nijmegen, waar hij in 1986 het kandidaatsexamen met genoegen en in 1989 het doctoraalexamen cum laude aflegde. De wetenschappelijke belangstelling die met name het schrijven van de doctoraalscriptie in hem had gewekt, deed hem besluiten een aanstelling als Assistent in Opleiding bij de vakgroep GLTC aan genoemde universiteit te ambiëren; in deze periode (1990-1995) verrichtte hij het onderzoek dat zijn beslag heeft gekregen in het onderhavige proefschrift. Aansluitend werd hij in deeltijd als junior-docent bij dezelfde vakgroep belast met de verzorging van enkele colleges op het gebied van de Griekse letterkunde. Vanaf september 1997 komt daar een part-time aanstelling bij, waarin hem de taak zal worden opgedragen, software te ontwikkelen als cursusmateriaal ten behoeve van studenten in de taalverwervingsfase Grieks en Latijn. Op verscheidene internationale congressen heeft hij lezingen gegeven, die geleid hebben tot een aantal wetenschappelijke publicaties. Daarnaast is hij, met een onderbreking van één jaar, sinds 1986 als docent klassieke talen werkzaam in het middelbaar onderwijs, sinds enkele jaren op het Stedelijk Gymnasium in zijn geboorte- en huidige woonplaats.